THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC
QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXV.—APRIL, 1910—No. 138.

SOME FACTORS IN THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

IT IS a characteristic of all great religious, as of all great social and political movements that, no matter how full and copious may be the literature relating to any one of them, it is always possible to present it, or the conditions and circumstances that gave rise to it, in some fresh aspect. Of no religious movement, I believe, is this so true as of that here dealt with; nor could there, I am further convinced, be a more opportune time than the present for studying certain influences which I venture to designate factors at work in its rise and earlier development—factors which, it may fairly be supposed, tended to shape its course and its ultimate issue. And for this reason—that the Oxford Movement, while in no sense, as some maintain, a spent force, seems to have reached a definite stage in its history, one whence, so to speak, it may advance in either of two directions. The stream, that is to say, may proceed onward, gathering force, volume and clearness, towards the great ocean of Catholicism ("to the place whence it came, thither it shall return again"), or spend itself, in scattered rivulets, among the barren sands of Ritualism, Modernism and petty schism. Nor are the causes far to seek for an apparent tendency towards the latter issue. The Evangelical and the Puseyite of fifty years ago, however widely they might differ on certain points of doctrine, church government and practice, were at one concerning the "fundamentals" of orthodox (Biblical) Christianity. To-day, on the contrary, the Modernists of Anglicanism, the "Broad-churchmen," less aggressive, less blatant,

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1910, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

possibly, than the older men, the school of the "essays and reviews," are, or seem to be, the dominant party, if not an actual majority in the communion to which they professedly belong. Between such "rationalizers" and the "Romanizers" there is, obviously, a great gulf fixed. The moderate men, if there are any left, find themselves called upon to make a choice, distasteful in either case, between "liberalism" and "Popery." The Evangelicals, for all their growing churchliness, are in even worse case. Modernism, masquerading as "higher criticism," has made a myth of their infallible Bible. There remains to them only a hopeless shutting of their eyes to facts and conditions as they are—a conservatism as out of date as the dodo—or submission to a Divinely appointed, infallible Vicar of Christ.

Although, therefore, I endeavored in a former article[1] to give some account of the more remote sources and of the logical destiny—God's *terminus ad quem* of the Oxford Movement, I shall here attempt to deal with certain factors, as I have ventured to term them, which, as already said, may be looked upon as having influenced its general course, and may possibly affect its ultimate issue.

Something, as was pointed out in the article referred to, must be allowed to the time, the circumstances and the conditions under which this counter-reformation took definite form and beginning. How much it is, perhaps, difficult to estimate correctly; it is certain, at least, that, humanly speaking, no moment could have seemed, at first sight, so unfavorable. It was at a time when Liberalism and Erastianism in Church and State were at floodtide, when a reform government was at the height of its popularity, when only at Oxford the traditional "home of lost causes," were Conservatism and the rights of the national Church so much as considered. Yet no movement could, as it proved, have been more opportune. The excesses of the French Revolution of 1830 had given British Toryism a new lease of life; its friends could point to events across the channel as the legitimate fruits of Liberalism; it was a time when the government, in abolishing certain Irish bishoprics, had laid profane hands on the Church of God. It was the darkest hour, and the man, with his message, was not wanting.

No study of the movement, however, it may be said without hesitation, can be called complete which fails to take into account as a preliminary, or rather as a predisposing influence, the religious condition of England at the close of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Nor should consideration of this condition be confined to that of the national establishment, or even of the various Nonconformist sects commonly known as "Dissenters." The blight of eighteenth century indifferentism, of revolutionary liberalism, fell no less fatally on the insignificant remnant of the glorious English Church of St. Augustine, St. Thomas and Blessed John Fisher than on her lost and separated children. A recent work on "The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England," referred to in the July (1909) number of the Dublin *Review,* needs only to be consulted in order to confirm what is here said. It was a lukewarm, Godless and "respectable" age—respectability hates zeal as disturbing and unbecoming a gentleman—as the literature dealing with it abundantly shows, and not the Church herself, whether in England or on the Continent of Europe, was immune from its soul-deadening influences. How, indeed, should she be, since while Divine, she is also human, and is, humanly, no more holy than her children?

---

[1] AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1909.

In regard to the actual movement under consideration, moreover, certain political tendencies and conditions must, as will have been gathered from what was said just now, be taken into account, and I shall, I am sure, be forgiven for reviewing them here as briefly and as dispassionately as possible. This influence, for that is what it comes to, predominant at the time we speak of, may, perhaps, be best defined by an old name, Whiggism, otherwise Whiggery. This, again, may be made comprehensible to twentieth century American readers, for want of a better synonym—and politics, strictly speaking, apart—as constitutionalism in Church and State, the supremacy of the latter, that is of parliament, over all causes and persons, spiritual and temporal. It is also, as my readers are doubtless aware, known as Erastianism, and has been seen as Royal Supremacy in England, as "Gallicanism" in France and as Josephism in Austria. It began, one may say, with Constantine, and has been successfully resisted by one power only—the Apostolic See.

Whiggism, then, or Whiggery, which began with resistance to the Stuarts, was not by any means a popular movement south of the Tweed at any time, though, like other political movements, it had its days of triumph and apparent favor. It was, I believe, Lord Beaconsfield who said that the Whig aristocracy—between whom and himself there was, as we say, no love lost—had assumed to their own profit all authority, royal or ecclesiastical, to say nothing of the monastic lands. Those are not, indeed, his exact words, but they convey, so far as my memory serves me, the gist of the charge against them. A brief course of Macaulay, supplemented by Thackeray's "Four Georges," will enable any one to arrive at some estimate as to its truth or otherwise.

It began, as I said a moment ago, with resistance to the Stuarts, about whom there are, of course, various opinions, flattering or the exact opposite. But it may be well, perhaps, to point out that it was the ecclesiastical policy of Charles I. and of Charles II., the attempt to impose the King's religion and, still worse, the King's Bishops on the national Church of Scotland which chiefly and most violently roused the opposition of the Western Presbyterians, under the leadership of the Marquis of Argyll. In other words, it was a movement, popular in a sense, but guided and controlled by a landholding aristocracy, heirs of the barons whose turbulence had made Scotland for centuries so difficult, if not impossible to govern, almost another Poland. Scott's "Old Mortality" and "Legend of Montrose," together with certain of Aytoun's "Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers," give, I may say, as vivid a picture of this struggle of Whiggism in its beginnings as can be obtained. It is a struggle of interest to Catholics, inasmuch as the principles at stake were so vital. Royal supremacy was, at least, preferable to that of parliament, aristocratic or otherwise.

Whiggism, then, if afterwards chiefly political, was in its origins most distinctively Puritan, imbued with an unconquerable hate of "prelacy and Popery," terms which it regarded, or professed to regard, as practically synonymous. The spiritual tyranny of local Presbyterianism—and it was both real and bitter—the landed aristocracy of Scotland could afford to ignore, the ministers having as proper a sense of what was due to the "princes of Israel" as the court Bishops of Constantine or Louis XIV. Here, again, the "Legend of Montrose" will help the reader to understand what I mean.

It was only natural, therefore, that the "Popery" of James II., his assaults, not on liberty, as popular tradition has it, but, as Mr. Chesterton has so well pointed out, on constitutional precedent, should have rendered him in the eyes of a Protestant aristocracy—whose privileges he had dared to invade—wholly unfit to govern them, a conviction which they proceeded to translate into action without unnecessary delay. It was their power or his that was at stake; the issue, as we know, for good or for ill was in favor of the former.

We can follow the development of this constitutional and distinctly aristocratic theory of government from the "Bill of Rights" imposed on William of Orange to the conditions exacted from the Elector of Hanover, concerning whom Thackeray's "Four Georges," already referred to, will give all the information that may be desired. We can follow it, indeed, if so disposed, through the "betrayal" of the first reform bill of 1832 to the final mergence of Whiggism in present day Radicalism. What is beyond, Providence—and Mr. Lloyd George—only know.

That which chiefly interests us here, however, is the attitude of the Whig aristocracy towards the national Church. Starting, as we have seen, in opposition to prelacy, that is, to what we may, I suppose, define as spiritual autocracy, as distinct from spiritual democracy, it is easy to see in what spirit the heirs and successors of the original Whiggish Covenanters would be likely to meet any assertion of independence on the part of a communion which they—rightly enough, as we know—regarded as merely "a creature of the State," a department, in fact, of the civil service. And that State, we must remember, had long since become synonymous in their estimation with their noble selves. Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, they might possibly admit, created the national Church as a department of government, but they would, if I am not greatly mistaken, have assigned to the voluntary assent of Parliament a much larger share in the task than either of the monarchs in question would have been inclined to concede. At all events, the growth of constitutionalism under the Hanoverian dynasty especially, had, they would have argued, not without reason, transferred an ever-increasing measure of the royal claims and prerogatives to Parliament—again, to themselves, not, of course, to the wicked and disloyal Tories, still more or less tainted with Jacobitism, principally more. It is a taint, I may remark in passing, some of us are even yet not wholly free. If so—and Parliament after all was master of the situation, thanks to the bargain made with the original "German lairdie"—then Henry's powers as head of the Church and Elizabeth's as supreme governor of the same, as transmitted nominally to their successors, belonged really and actually to the sole source of all authority, royal or ecclesiastical, the two houses of Parliament.

This, you will note, makes Whiggism, as indeed it is identical with what is commonly called Erastianism, with the theory of government which holds the State—Parliament, not the King, except in name—'over all causes and persons, civil and ecclesiastical, within these dominions supreme." Cæsarism, the supremacy of the monarch, as Henry planned it and as the Czar of Russia exercises it, is an unmitigated evil, but it is trifling in its effects as compared with the spiritual supremacy of a popularly elected assembly of "Jews, Turks, heretics and infidels," if I may be excused the expression. It is a theory, be it said, no less prevalent in North America than elsewhere, and it is our chief offense as "subjects of a foreign power," the Pope to wit, that we refuse to submit to it. But it is to such supremacy that the Anglican communion since the fall of the Stuarts, in 1688, has had to submit; a supremacy wielded, let me add, without ruth or consideration, by an assembly which, from session to session, with the extension of the franchise, has grown less fit, but more relentlessly eager to exercise it. Which of itself, and without any other cause, is enough to account for the Oxford Movement. Even the very Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland has a greater measure of autonomy than the Church of Henry and Elizabeth.

We have, therefore, at the date assigned by Newman as the definite beginning of the Oxford counter-reformation—namely, 1833—a purely constitutional Erastian government, largely, if not wholly aristocratic, in spite of the reform act of the previous year, one which, little by little, had curtailed the royal prerogatives—of its own giving, remember—and increased its own. It was a government which, as we said just now, regarded itself, as *Mr. Punch* put it, as "providentially chosen to govern the country" and all its concerns, spiritual as well as temporal. It was merely consistent on the part of such a government that it should dismiss the "creatures of its own appointing"—namely, certain Irish Protestant Bishops—and abolish their sees. It was as much a matter of course as the disbandment of a regiment and the consequent retirement of its officers. But it is worth noting as an act of spiritual autocracy which, so far as I am aware, no Pope ever exercised.

The spiritual peers in Parliaments did not, it may be supposed, submit to this intrusion by the State without some more or less formal protest, which drew from the Premier a significant warning as to setting their own houses in order. Bishops, as has been remarked, were no favorites with the Whigs. To their credit, be it said, that at the worst of times the Anglican episcopate, their method of appointment notwithstanding, have for the most part had a certain sense of official dignity of their nominal prerogatives as rulers of the national Church, which may, perhaps, be described as traditional and largely accounted for by the power of association; by the fact that never during three hundred years had the most anti-Papal of them ceased to claim, however hopelessly, the rights and privileges of their alleged prereformation predecessors, holders of the same sees and, like them, peers of the realm.

Be that as it may, however, we know that the Whig government of 1832, after abolishing the Irish bishoprics referred to, proceeded to discuss a similar measure in connection with the Church of England. Contemporary accounts, many of them personal, go to show that the Bishops were most unpopular, to the extent of being mobbed on their way to Parliament. They were supposed, on what evidence I do not know, to have opposed the reform bill. The Church of England was naturally conservative in her sympathies, reactionary as it is the fashion to call it, otherwise clerical. Now, the reform bill, for some reason not easily to be gathered, seems curiously enough to have been as popular with the masses—again I must crave your indulgence of a cant term—as it was distasteful to the peers and great landowners, Whig and Tory alike. It was, apparently, at this time that the Prime Minister gave the Bishops the hint concerning their houses and a warning as to what might befall them should they fail to act on it.

It was at such a crisis, when a measure aimed at the very existence of the national Church by a "tyrannical and Erastian State" was, so far as men could judge, met with approval by a vast majority of Englishmen, that Keble preached his famous sermon on "National Apostasy" in St. Mary the Virgin's Church, at Oxford, and this Oxford Movement began.

It is not my purpose, even after so much that, I fear, has seemed unduly long and possibly irrelevant, to attempt any detailed account of the movement itself. The purpose of this article, indeed, is professedly to serve as an introduction to the study of the Oxford Movement, and to give such impressions of it as my reading and my personal experience of it have left on my own mind. Before doing so, however, I venture to commend to the reader's attention two works which I have no hesitation in saying are the most important of all that have been written in connection with the subject—Newman's "Apologia" and "William George Ward and the Oxford Movement." Having done so, I will, with his permission, proceed as it were to pass the movement in review very much, as I said just now, as I have known it. Such an account of it will, at least, have the merit of being, so to speak, at first hand, even if, as I greatly fear, it have no other to commend it.

I would ask, then, that there may be borne in mind the two principles referred to—the Erastian theory of State supremacy in spirituals, which holds the national communion to be practically a department of the civil service, and the traditional Anglican theory of the "rights and privileges of the Church," a theory to which "continuity" with the prereformation Church of the English people, though only claimed and not proved, would, of course, lend strength and plausibility. These, which we may call the opposing forces, would, we should imagine, inevitably come into irreconcilable conflict when the State so far "invaded" the territory nominally under the control of the Church as to suppress certain bishoprics and to threaten to suppress others. Strangely enough, no such conflict occurred, not at least where it might most naturally have been looked for—namely, in the House of Lords. The English Bishops, however sorry they may have been, and presumably were, for their suppressed Irish brethren, were well content to comply with the government's hint as to setting their own houses in order, or, at all events, to make some show of doing so. More, they promptly and emphatically disowned as rebels and traitors the overzealous champions of "the Church's rights" and of those of the episcopate, and proceeded to assist the State by all the means at their command in putting an end to that which they stigmatized as "a disloyal and wholly unjustifiable agitation."

This, indeed, is one of the most curious, as it is one of the most interesting aspects of the Oxford Movement—the bitter, unrelenting opposition of the Bishops to those whose professed aim was to restore the Church and the Church's "fathers in God" to her and their ancient rights and privileges. No measures, as contemporary accounts show, were too rigorous, no reproofs too harsh for use against these "innovators," against those who were then and still are regarded as betrayers of Protestantism and of "the Church of their baptism," as secret agents of "the Pope and the Jesuits." That the aim of the early Tractarians was not to innovate, but to restore disused and nominally lawful doctrines and practices, the lecture I had the honor of giving on this subject last year was, I trust, sufficient to prove to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced person. I need only repeat here that their claims were based on the formularies and definitions of Anglicanism itself; that their professed object was to "restore" the national communion to the position which, as they believed and taught, she had held not only prior to "the troubles of the Tudor period," but which she was intended by the "reformers" themselves—so far as words could be taken to indicate their purpose—to hold always. That at least was their spiritual and ecclesiastical standpoint at the beginning of the movement. They denied wholly and sincerely the claims of "Rome" to supremacy and exclusive jurisdiction. The "Church" of their allegiance was, in their eyes, the Church of St. Augustine, the Church of the English people, national and independent of Pope or of King, by right, if not in fact. It was this right, indeed, which they desired to translate into reality. It was in pursuit of this that they entered on that "middle way" between Rome and Geneva, between Popery and Protestantism, which to us, as to so many of their heirs to-day, seems so illogical and to lead nowhere if not to Rome, but which to them, as they set their feet in it, with a faith, a loyalty and a simple courage which are beyond admiration, was to be God's highway, leading to the City of Peace—a highway so broad, so plain, so easy to follow that "the wayfaring man, though a fool," could not err therein.

As, indeed, to so many then and since it proved and has proved, as also we must for the time being regard it, if we would rightly understand the true nature of this, the most wonderful surely of all religious revivals since the great apostasy of the sixteenth century. What other prospect think you would have led studious Oxford divines, quiet, unassuming country clergy, men and women of all ranks, to set foot in it, but this vision of the goal to be attained? Broad, easy and plain in a sense the road unquestionably was, yet in no less true a sense narrow, hard and difficult, thorn strewn and set about with hardships with moral if not with physical martyrdom. Do I seem to exaggerate? Let the reader study Newman's "Apologia" and he will be convinced that I speak "words of truth and soberness." Believe me—if I may name myself at such a juncture—I know whereof I speak.

And what, then, was the goal they looked to attain? Nothing less, as I said just now, and none other than the City of Peace. They set before their eyes the vision of "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing;" of a veritable "New Jerusalem, adorned as a bride to meet her husband." True, and as we know, they all unknowingly ascribed her attributes and her glories to a creature of the state, to an organization that was not the Church, but the fact remains, and must be taken into account as explaining much that otherwise is not merely inexplicable, but without reason or excuse.

It was only, however, "by slow and almost imperceptible degrees that this "vision glorious" dawned on the spiritual eyes of the first Tractarians. Newman and his immediate followers since Newman, from the very beginning was the recognized leader of the movement. "Compared with him," says Froude in a memorable passage, "they were as ciphers, he the indicating number." It was this position of leadership, indeed, which made every act and word of Newman's of such vital importance to the revival, men, it is said, going so far as to profess belief not so much in principles as in Newman personally. It was a position and a responsibility which we may be sure he did not fail to recognize to the fullest extent.

What we have chiefly to note at this stage is the fact that, so far as we can gather, far more importance was attached during the twelve years of Newman's leadership—from 1833 to 1845—to doctrine than to ritual, to principles than to their external and symbolic expression. This, of course, was only what, under the circumstances, we should expect. The very foundations of "Catholic belief" had to be relaid. It was to this task, first and chiefly, as of infinitely greater importance than all else, that the first leaders of the counter-reformation set themselves. The primary, one might say the whole aim of those remarkable "Tracts for the Times," whence the party derived its original name of Tractarians, was to inculcate those doctrines commonly known as Catholic which had been held by the prereformation Church of the English people and which, professedly at least—it is well to repeat it—had the sanction of the Prayer Book and the Articles of Religion.

That such an attempt to teach "Popery" under the forms and within the fold of a "reformed Church" should rouse violent opposition on the part of the great mass of English Protestants, Anglican and Nonconformist alike, was only natural. "Traitor" was the mildest term applied to them, "Jesuits in disguise" the commonest, and, hard as it may be to realize, applied for the most part in all honest belief of its truth. England, in a word, would have no "middle way" between the "pure Gospel"—its own—and the "soul-destroying errors of Rome;" it must be one or the other, and the enemies of the movement saw and proclaimed from its very beginnings what its goal must inevitably be, a clearness of vision, be it said, only now attained to by the true spiritual heirs of Keble, Newman and Pusey; only, indeed, by a few of them.

The greatest frenzy of abuse and opposition—those are the only adequate words—was aroused by the attempted revival of the practice of confession. All the bitter, unreasoning prejudices of ignorant Protestant bigotry, all the foul lies launched against the Church's divine tribunal of penance were revived and hurled against the man who dared to use the power and authority received, so far as words could give them, at the Bishop's hands in ordination. And from that day to this—I say it without fear of contradiction—the confessional more than all else is the centre round which the storm of controversy has raged most fiercely.

Nor in making this assertion do I forget that there has, to all appearance, been no less fierce a conflict in respect of Eucharistic doctrine and ritual. I do not for a moment lose sight of the truth that "it is the Mass that matters." Yet men will, I honestly believe, or would forgive "ritual excesses," as it is the fashion to call them—"man-millinery" is a less courteous term—would forgive even belief in the Real Presence were it not that both, and the former especially, are associated with "priestcraft," and that the essence of "priestcraft" is, in the minds of Protestants, the claim to govern consciences, to "come between the soul and God," as they say—and believe; in a word, "the accursed confessional." It is my honest belief, based on much that I have seen, read and known, that had the Tractarians and their successors been less true, less faithful to their principles—to their ordination vows—in this matter, they would have escaped one-half and more of the persecution they have had to endure. Are not these the very "head and front of our offending" in the eyes of a Protestant community? Let me add this, as of some little interest, that it is on this "power of the keys" that the Anglican ordinal lays stress, an ordinal which is defective in matter and form because it omits all reference to the essential power of offering sacrifice.

It was, therefore, no uncommon attitude of mind which was expressed by a devout, whole-souled Evangelical friend of mine when he said he could more easily believe in transubstantiation than in the apostolic succession, in God's gift rather than "man's authority." It is an attitude of mind, that is to say, which holds it lawful for Christ's minister to identify himself with his Lord in the most solemn of all religious rites and to say of the symbols of Christ's choosing: "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," but forbids him to say, in the tribunal of penance: "By His authority I absolve thee." The one is "Gospel ministry," the other "priestly tyranny." But the attitude must be taken into account if we would understand Protestant opposition to "Ritualism and Popery."

I am no less convinced, however, that had the Tractarians been disloyal to this vital principle of all true religious life, the sacrament of penance, they would most assuredly have lost all real hold on the other and even more vital one, belief, such as they possess, in the Eucharistic Presence of Our Blessed Lord. This, I think, you will admit to be a reasonable contention if you will endeavor for one moment to realize what would become of our belief in that Presence were the sacrament of reconciliation to be taken from us.

Doctrine, then, was of infinitely greater importance—as it is and should be—in the estimation of the early Tractarians than ritual, though that, as we shall see, was to have its due place, and perhaps more than its due place, as the movement grew and developed. How far these counter-reformers went in this matter of outward symbolism may be measured by the "use" still preserved—so far as I know—in Newman's last Anglican parish of Littlemore, near Oxford; a "use," be it said, which would nowadays be considered extremely "moderate."

I must ask leave at this point to express my regret that I cannot make this matter of ritual development more easy of comprehension to those who, like my readers, are probably wholly unfamiliar with it, by means of pictures. If, however, they will range in imagination from a church filled with high, square pews, with a pulpit blocking the chancel arch and a "communion table" wholly unadorned save by the tables of the law above it, to a church in all points, such as a Catholic church should be, but, alas! so seldom is, they will get some idea, however inadequate, of the changes wrought in seventy odd years. If, moreover, they will keep certain "points of ritual" in their minds—I will make them as few and clear as possible—they will, I trust, experience no great difficulty in following what I may have to say regarding this external but very important phase of the movement we are considering.

These points are, briefly, those commonly known in the controversy that has raged incessantly concerning them for nearly or over half a century as the "six points of Catholic ritual." They begin, if my memory serves me rightly, with that spoken of as the "eastward position," the position, that is to say, assumed by the celebrant at Mass, with his back to the congregation. It is a position which has always, and rightly, been regarded as "sacerdotal," as symbolizing a sacrificial act, from the days of Archbishop Laud to the present time, and is, therefore, for that very reason the most important, the most significant of all, and consequently the one most strenuously resisted. The Puritan party in Stuart times knew perfectly well what Laud's injunctions to replace the holy table "altarwise" against the east wall of churches and cathedrals—where the high altar had stood in Catholic times—symbolized and was meant to symbolize, what it inevitably involved. The priest was to supplant the minister, sacraments the "pure Gospel." It was the first step, and a long one, towards the return of "Popery and the idolatrous Mass." It counted heavily in the indictment brought against him by Cromwell's parliamentary saints, as heavily as his daring to restore the images of Our Lady and the Divine Child to the porch of St. Mary's Church, at Oxford, where they stand to this day. It was on these charges, rather than on his loyalty to his King, that he went to a death which we English Tories, Jacobites by tradition, are fain to glorify as a true martyrdom.

The second "point," the use of lighted candles on the holy table during the celebration of the communion office, was one of lesser, but still of great import, symbolizing, as it was held to do, a special sacramental Presence of Our Blessed Lord at that time and place. It was fought no less strenuously than the first in the pulpit, the press, secular and religious, and even in the courts of the realm, learned decisions being given for and against it. About the eastward position, indeed, there might be some doubt, some ambiguity in the prayer book rubric, some question as to the true meaning of the words, "the north side of the holy table." But the lights, with certain other points, rested on the ornaments rubric, as it is called, and were therefore subjects of legal controversy, from which, it may be said, they have even yet hardly emerged. These others, merely to enumerate them, were: Colored stoles, Eucharistic vestments, the mixed chalice and the use of wafers at Holy Communion in place of ordinary bread. I am not sure, however, whether stoles and vestments do not count as one "point," with the ceremonial use of incense as the sixth.

To us, members of a divine, infallible Church, to whom her decisions in such matters are sufficient and final, it seems incredible that families, parishes and dioceses, one might say a whole nation, should have been rent into factions and parties over such externals, still more that lawsuits and even imprisonments should have resulted from their use. But, as has been well said by a recent grave historian, Dr. Gairdner, sentiment goes for much in this world, and these externals, it must always be remembered, are of import only as symbols of certain beliefs and principles, and as such are of as vital interest in the religious life as flags and names are in the lives of nations and individuals. The difference between a green flag and a red one, between one King and another, royalty and republic, what may it not amount to? A whole nation, to quote Dr. Gairdner again, went mad with a no-Popery frenzy in 1850 because a foreign Bishop—the Pope—gave to certain other Bishops titles and jurisdiction over the Catholics of England. Why, then, should we wonder that the difference between a surplice and a chasuble, between one position and another, should have been of such import in respect of a revival within a Protestant communion of forgotten doctrines and practices as strenuously loved and claimed by the one party as they were hated and repudiated by the other? The externals, in a word, were the signs by which men showed to which camp they belonged, "Catholic" or "Protestant," using the terms in their Anglican sense, just as surely as the white cockade and the black proclaimed whether a man were loyalist or Hanoverian, for King or Elector.

This "ritual controversy," however, did not, so far as I am aware —but I speak under correction—assume serious importance during the twelve years of Newman's leadership of the Oxford Movement. He and his immediate followers were, as has been said, more concerned with doctrines than with externals, which, in any case, might have hindered, rather than aided their cause, by giving unnecessary offense, and the "use" of Littlemore, to return to it for a moment, marks, I fancy, the limit of his ritual development prior to his submission to the Church he had so long sought for and which it cost him so much to find.

What his submission meant to those whom he had left behind, to the Anglican communion, one might truly say, to the nation at large, it is impossible for us at this day to realize in any adequate measure. Two phrases, however, occur to the memory—the one Disraeli's, the other Froude's. "The Church of England reeled beneath the blow." So the statesman; we add—if he did not, I have no means of verifying the reference—"from which it has never recovered." "What the Catholic Church in England is to-day," wrote Froude, "she owes to one man—John Henry Newman." Truth or exaggeration, it shows the estimation in which Newman was held by his contemporaries. At all events, he who had really begun, who had directed and led the counter-reformation from the beginning, had confessed its failure, so far as he was concerned; that is one view of it. We should rather say, had shown what its goal, whether as a movement or for the individual, must inevitably be if it were, indeed, as was claimed, the work of God. There can be no doubt, however, but that, in the eyes of those who could not follow him in this last step, he had "stultified his whole position and teaching." Many, indeed, encouraged by his example, came to the same decision at no less cost. But more remained behind, and a new leader had to be found.

It was from this new leader, a man of only lesser ability than Newman, in that Newman, like Shakespeare, Dante and St. Thomas, stands by himself; of no less piety, so far as it is possible for us to judge, devotion and sincerity—I speak advisedly—Edward Bouverie Pusey, that the Tractarians took their second and best known name og "Puseyites." It was a name, be it remarked in passing, no less obnoxious to British Protestantism than that of Jesuit, with which, indeed, it was commonly regarded as synonymous. It was under Pusey's leadership that ritual, to judge by the course of events, came to be considered of greater importance than formerly. It was as though the Tractarians felt surer of their position and had grown tired of a vain attempt to conciliate their opponents. Their doctrinal position, moreover, was becoming, year by year, more clearly defined. The authorized teaching of the party was, indeed, far from being "Roman," as it was the fashion to term all dogmatic definitions subsequent to the sixteenth century, and as may be gathered from a study of the theology of that period. But we may say, again briefly, that the Church's authority—meaning by the Church "the general consent of Catholic Christendom"—as binding in conscience, apostolic succession, baptismal regeneration, the power of the keys and the doctrine of the Real Presence—not Transubstantiation—make up the sum of their teaching.

About the first, as about the last of these, there was, it may be said, a certain amount of ambiguity, not to say nebulous comprehensiveness, the most fatal vice of Anglicanism. "Schools" were already being formed wherein men held these doctrines in more or less advanced or moderate fashion, according as the "views" of the individual developed, there being, of course, no final and infallible living authority to decide and to be obeyed. "The general consent of Catholic Christendom" might exclude all definitions later than the Eastern schism, of the "undivided Church," or might include those of the Council of Trent. Newman's "Tract Ninety," indeed, set out to prove that the "Thirty-nine (Anglican) Articles of Religion" were capable of a Catholic, that is, of a Tridentine interpretation. Again, belief in the "Real Presence" ranged from a vague sacramentarianism, akin to mysticism, to consubstantiation, though from the first men of goodwill and fervent devotion looked longingly for a definition which they could accept, content in the meantime with a very lively faith in the reality of Our Blessed Lord's sacramental presence and showing a most edifying devotion to "the Blessed Sacrament."

But about the power of the keys, the authority of the apostolic priest to bind and to loose, in the tribunal of penance, there was no doubt at all, even if men differed as to the necessity and obligation, for all men and women, at all times of sacramental confession. The words of the Prayer Book in the ordinal and in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick were clear and unmistakable. The power existed in "the Church;" had been deliberately preserved during the "changes of the sixteenth century," where so much had been as deliberately discarded. Her ministers, therefore, were bound by their ordination vows, and as they should answer to God Himself for the authority entrusted to them, to use it whenever and wherever called upon to do so. It was, as I have said, the most vital, as it was the severest test of their loyalty to the principles they professed, that on which all else depended. To deny this power of the priesthood was to deny all; it was of the very essence of their position. To say that many endured a veritable martyrdom of obloquy, hatred and persecution on behalf of "the seal of sacramental confession," is but to speak the barest truth. To say, also, that this loyalty, thus sorely tried, met with its reward at God's hands in those whom it brought into His fold, and no less, perhaps, however differently as it may seem to us, in those who stayed, or who still stay, in the City of Confusion, is, I am honestly convinced, since God is the Rewarder of all who serve Him. If you find this hard to believe of those who stay, study such lives—to name a few only—as those of Charles Lowder, "Father" Dolling or of Pusey, and you will, I am sure, agree with my contention that a man's very staying is often as sure a test of his loyalty to God's guidance as is his following it, when and if, in God's inscrutable Providence, it leads him, all unworthy, into the City of Peace.

It was, however, on account of the other "certain doctrine"—that of baptismal regeneration—that the movement underwent a trial second only to Newman's "going to Rome." Here, again, the Prayer Book, the authorized teaching of their communion, was, if words meant anything, on the side of the Puseyites. "Seeing, now, *that this child is regenerate, and born of water and the Holy Spirit.*" Yet when, about the year 1850, a certain clergyman of the name of Gorham taught openly that the baptized child was *not* regenerate, and his Bishop proceeded against him, the highest "ecclesiastical" court of the realm, the Privy Council, representing the Queen as "over all persons and causes, spiritual and temporal, in these her dominions supreme," upheld the "heretic" and declared it lawful to hold "either view of baptismal regeneration."

The result, as the reader doubtless knows, was the conversion of Archdeacon, afterwards Cardinal, Manning and of many prominent Tractarians, lay and clerical. Pusey, however, remained loyal to the principles he held; the State might tolerate, or even encourage heresy, but the "Church," though in bondage, was not bound by the State's unauthorized dogmatic decisions.

It is, however, from this time onward that we may date the "ritual controversy" in all its bitterness. Its effect on the movement itself was curious and interesting. In some way it seemed to divide men into parties and schools, differing in ritual as they did in "views," yet, judging by later events and by what I have been able to gather from one source and another, the "persecution" of an extreme man, for "ritual excesses," as they were called—"excesses" indistinguishable from "pure Popery"—still more, his imprisonment or deprivation, appeared to mean a "closing up" on the part of advance guard, main force and rear guard, to resist a common enemy.

For it was not long, as may be imagined, before the State, urged thereto by a militant Protestantism, alarmed at so "widespread a conspiracy to undo the work of the glorious reformation (!)," attempted, in Lord Beaconsfield's words, "to put down Ritualism." The public worship regulation act of 1874 was the most notable of these attempts, as, in the end, it was the most notable failure. During its active administration, however, numbers of "extreme men" proved their loyalty to beliefs and principles by suffering imprisonment for them. The world sneered and called it a "cheap martyrdom," but its effects were not to be denied, however they might be accounted for. It is within my personal recollection that one such imprisonment added twenty thousand new members to the defensive society known as the "English Church Union." Men are influenced by loyalty to principle, let the world say what it will, and the quiet persistence with which such men took up their work on release from prison and resumed the "offenses" for which they had been punished did more for the "Catholic revival" in the Anglican communion than it is by any means easy to estimate.

It is no part of my purpose to go into many details in relation to this matter of ritual, still less to recount names and controversies in which, naturally, you cannot be expected to take any serious interest. I prefer to dwell more particularly on what may be called the doctrinal developments of the movement, both as being of immeasurably greater importance than any questions of ritual can possibly be, and also as affording the only true key to the real nature of the revival itself. For, after all, it is what a man believes that matters, and ritual is, as we have said, of importance only as it is the outward symbol and expression of beliefs and principles.

Newman's position, to refer to it once more—the position of the movement as a whole during the years between 1833 and 1845—was that of the *via media,* the middle way beteen the "innovations of Rome"—all developments of doctrine, one might say, subsequent to the Council of Nice—and the "shortcomings of Protestantism." The Church of England, according to this view, was to hold the golden mean between two extremes, to be "Catholic, but not Papal," as the phrase went, and the spirit of the early Tractarians was as definitely anti-Roman as it was anti-Protestant, using the terms, of course, in their Anglican sense. "Rome," moreover, meaning thereby the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Peter, was held responsible for the "schism of the sixteenth century," whereby the Church in England was, to quote a recent writer, "cut off from the main body" of Catholic Christendom. Indeed, a whole school of "Church defense" writers and speakers taught, in season and out—some do so still, I believe—that "the Church of England prior to the sixteenth century was not subject to the Pope in spirituals," or, as the writer just referred to puts it, "a protesting Catholicism"—whatever that may be—"was quite familiar to Englishmen." There is no need, in view of what Dr. Maitland and Dr. Gairdner, two Anglican authorities, have written, to refute such statements here; it is only necessary to call attention to them as indicating an attitude of mind to which the early years of the Oxford Movement may be said to have given rise, and which, as has been said, is still by no means uncommon. Indeed, this anti-Roman attitude was, as Newman has shown, a necessity of the Tractarian position, the assumed possibility of a national Catholicism, independent of the divinely appointed centre of unity. The Tractarians were reviving doctrines and practices commonly, and not unjustly, regarded as Popish, all arguments from the words of the Prayer Book to the contrary notwithstanding. Disuse was, practically, abolishment; the great mass of Englishmen, Anglican and Nonconformist, had no toleration for "mediævalism" or for "temporary compromise" made in the "fight against Papal aggression." The Tractarians were accused of "pandering to Rome," of leading men thither—which they most assuredly did—of being the secret emissaries of the "ancient enemy of England's civil and religious liberty." It was only by insisting on their middle position, on an imaginary independence of Rome in the past, of that "Church of the English people" of which they claimed to be the true heirs and successors; on a very real dependence of all Papal control in the present, that they could hope to persuade men that the movement was not destined to end in submission to the See of Peter.

Newman's submission to the Church, therefore, notwithstanding all his former protests, did incalculable harm, for a time at least, to this claim of theirs. It had proved false, men said, in the case of the leader of the movement; his middle way had, after all, led him by an inevitable logic to Rome. Why should the claim still prove true in the case of his followers? The middle way, even if it led nowhere, appealed, however, to many devout souls as the only safe way. Protestantism was abhorrent to them, the claims of the Vicar of Christ unscriptural and inadmissible. Where, then, should they find rest and peace if not in a communion which inclined neither to the one extreme nor to the other, which was "Catholic" with the Catholicism of the "undivided Church" and of the great General Councils? Logic? It was not by logic that God was pleased to save His people, but by faith and obedience to His guidance.

This, I think, is what we must try to realize if we would understand the movement rightly—namely, the spiritual import of each stage of its doctrinal development. This middle way, moreover, gave rise to a certain school of "safe," "moderate" men, very distinctively Anglican and national, the like of whom are still to be found; distrustful of "extreme" men and unwilling to be tied down to dogmatic definitions in matters relating to the Blessed Eucharist especially. They affected a stately and dignified, rather than an ornate ritual, but their chief characteristic was and is the tenacity with which they held and hold to an indefinite position in respect of dogma. "Dogmatism," as they call it—"speculation about sacred things"—was and is, to members of this school, little short of profanity—a rash, sacrilegious intrusion into mysteries too profound to be discussed. Certain doctrines for this school are "Catholic," others "Roman." It is for the devout layman to "hear the Church," to accept on her authority, that is, on theirs—neither claiming to be infallible, even though professedly bearing a divine commission to teach—which doctrines must be held and which rejected; where the line between "Catholic" and "Roman" is to be drawn. The line, I may say in passing, is as elusive as a statesman's "scientific frontier" and as difficult to find.

This is, believe me, no mere imaginary picture. I speak, if I may be allowed to say so, from personal experience of a very "safe" seminary, wherein the chief authority was just such a man as I have attempted to describe. That is, he frowned on all "extremes," whether of doctrine or of ritual, and rebuked the too logical inquirer into whys and wherefores—unable, it may be, to keep his balance on the master's spiritual tight-rope—as guilty of presumption, if not of want of faith, and of "a proper teachable spirit." The results among a number of young men more or less in earnest may be easily conceived. Most of us, I fancy, drifted into "Ritualism," as it was the fashion to call it; some of us, by God's mercy, into the Church which is logical, divine and infallible, whose frontiers are of God's own drawing, not of man's.

The "safe" school here referred to was nearly allied to that commonly known as "high and dry"—the name speaks for itself—merged, in fact, imperceptibly into it. These last were, one may say, rather the lineal successors of the older churchmen, the heirs of Laud and of the non-jurors of the early eighteenth century, than professed disciples of the new movement. They used it, indeed, and in practice allied themselves with it, up to a certain point, in order, presumably, to strengthen a position they had always held, with little or no hope—perhaps with little active desire—of convincing a careless and incredulous nation. But they also had no sympathy with or toleration for the "vagaries of Ritualism," in which they detected a certain disloyalty to national traditions and an equally distasteful leaning towards "Romanism." Nor, it must be confessed, had the younger, more extreme Puseyites much respect for these "survivals," whom they regarded as hopelessly antiquated.

The doctrinal position of these High Churchmen, those especially who to some extent fell in with and were influenced by the Oxford Movement, was very similar to that of the "moderates," with possibly a somewhat stronger, one might say a more aristocratic, churchmanship, a greater insistence on the rights and dignities, social as well as spiritual, of the clergy. It was of such men, largely recruited from the younger sons of the old landowning families—Whig and Tory—that it was said that they recognized three orders of clergy—Bishops, rectors and curates. They were, if not especially fervent, scholars and gentlemen, fulfilling their pastoral and magisterial duties with a certain dignified faithfulness that was not without its beneficial effects. You may get a view of them in Anthony Trollope's novels, of a state of society now practically consigned to the limbo of things that has served their purpose. They were, however, for the most part "Church and King" men, distinctly Erastian—that is, it never occurred to them, the older ones at least, to dispute or to question the supremacy of the State in spirituals, much as they might dislike or resent some of its decisions, the Gorham judgment, of which I have spoken, most of all. It was a school, however, inevitably destined as time went on to be absorbed, or, perhaps, supplanted by the less extreme section of Puseyites; not less Anglican, indeed, or even more ritualistically inclined, but less patient of "the tyranny of the State" and less ready to abate any of the "rights and privileges of the Church."

One aspect of the whole movement, theologically considered, is worth noting at this point. It is that Tractarians, Puseyites and "Anglo-Catholics" alike exercised a certain "reservation" in the inculcating of "Catholic doctrines and practices" in respect of the former, if anything, more than in respect of the latter. Ritual, whether moderate, high or extreme, might, indeed, be plausibly excused as a mere matter of externals, of decency in worship, and allowed to pass as ambiguous or even without special dogmatic significance. But with "Catholic doctrine" the case was otherwise and far less simple. It was and is, I believe, still held that dogma must be imparted carefully and by degrees to a "Protestant" congregation much, indeed, as a missionary would, presumably, impart it to converts from heathenism or as it was imparted to catechumens in the early Church. In any case, such an admixture of truth and error may very well be excusable in teachers not under the guidance and authority of the infallible Church, especially where the teachers themselves are still progressing towards a goal and a certainty not yet attained, and are learning as well as teaching, year by year, a fuller measure and comprehension of "Catholic truth."

It is worth noting, also, that to the Puseyites of this middle period, as we may call it, from 1850, say, to 1880—the dates are not exact, of course, but will serve our purpose—we owe, if I am not mistaken, what is known as "the Branch Theory of Catholic Christendom." Newman, while maintaining that the national communion was a true and a Catholic Church, the Church of the English people, laid stress rather on the golden mean of her position between Rome and Geneva than on her actual participation, her present communion with "the rest of the Church Universal." He was more intent, that is to say, unless I have misread his aims, during his years of leadership on "restoring the national Church to her ancient and rightful position" than on "placing her in her true relationship with the Churches of Rome and Constantinople." It was, however, merely a due sense of proportion which led him to place the one before the other, to set her internal affairs in order, so to speak, before troubling as to her external relations, and it was by an easy and natural development of ideas that his successors in the leadership of the movement came to maintain that the "Church Universal" consisted of three "branches"—Greek, Roman and Anglican. These obviously, according to this theory, were held to possess a common faith in all "essential" matters, a common priesthood and a real, though invisible communion as sprung from a common stem, this stem being presumably the "undivided Church" prior to the Eastern schism. The theory, one must honestly admit, was plausible as well as fascinating to those especially who could not, or would not, acknowledge the divinely appointed primacy of the Vicar of Christ.

It justified not only the position of the Eastern schismatics and of "Anglo-Catholicism," but that of the Jansenists and so-called "Old Catholics" as well, and formed an argument—of a kind—against the "inadmissible claims and pretensions of the See of Rome." It afforded, in fact, all the comfort of being "in good company," even if, possibly, in the wrong, and gauged "Catholicity" by the weight of numbers on the one side or the other.

But the theory was not without its uses, under God's Providence, in the doctrinal development of the movement as a whole. Points of agreement between East and West to adopt their own terminology, between Rome, Constantinople and Canterbury, began to be sought for and to be made prominent rather than points of difference, a distinct gain to charity and a better mutual understanding. Gradually, moreover, the leaders of the movement came to realize, in some measure at least, the spiritual, doctrinal and liturgical obligations which such a theory necessarily involved. If the "English Church" was, indeed, a "branch of the Church Universal," then obviously her formularies, even where they seemed at variance with the "consent of Catholic Christendom," must be interpreted in the wider and more "Catholic" sense, not in the narrower and more local one, least of all, according to the "unauthorized rulings of an Erastian and tyrannical State." This, as will readily be recognized, was a great step gained. It not only opened out a wider vista of Catholic truth to those who were seeking it so earnestly, but a clearer view of the goal to be attained, as they then saw it, the "restoration," namely, of the "English Church" to her "ancient place and dignity," to that, in a word, of the Church of the English people, the Church of St. Augustine and of St. Thomas of Canterbury. How otherwise, indeed, could they hope to justify their claim to be an integral, living portion of the "Church Universal?"

It will be evident, surely, without my needing to dwell on it, that there are literally no limits, save, again, such as God's Providence or man's self-will may set, to the influence which such a conception of a united, Catholic Christendom, once fairly grasped, must inevitably have on devout and truth-seeking minds, or to its effect on the barriers of insularity, nationalism and prejudice which for three centuries had kept English churchmen out of touch and out of sympathy as well as out of communion with the Church of their fathers, of their country's ancient glories. We must, therefore, speaking with all reverence, consider it only natural that the "branch theory" should have grown, almost imperceptibly, into one which holds the national communion to be simply the old "Provinces of York and Canterbury," provinces, that is, of the "Western Patriarchate"—the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See—separated outwardly, through faults on both sides, from the "rest of Catholic Christendom." It was equally natural that antagonism to "Rome" should yield to recognition of the mutual relations of these provinces and the Holy See prior to the breach of the sixteenth century, if only through a comparison of the liberties enjoyed under Papal rule—setting its divine claims aside—with the Church's slavery under the tyranny of the State. The full claims of the Vicar of Christ to a primacy over the whole Church were not, indeed, by any means or readily admitted at this period, at all events, but I have a vivid recollection of a devout High Churchman of the older school, who in 1883 spoke of and publicly prayed for "the Bishop of Rome" as the "first Bishop of Christendom." That, one must admit, is a very significant admission. If the Pope is the "first Bishop," first even "among his equals," he must surely have claims to recognition, jurisdiction and authority other, higher and more extensive than even those of the local hierarchy, the "successor of St. Augustine"—the Archbishop of Canterbury—not excepted.

The next step, as I remember it, was to admit this claim of the Pope to "primacy among his equals," as of ecclesiastical, not of divine right, bestowed by the Church, arising out of the exigencies of her government, not directly or originally given by God Himself. But even such an inadequate admission leads men, as may easily be seen, very far from the traditional position of Anglicanism, farther, indeed, than they or we, perhaps, are able to realize. For if the Church has God's authority and is divinely guided in all things that concern her welfare, then what the Church gives God gives, and the primacy of Peter by divine right is on the verge of acknowledgment, as, in truth, it has since come to be by many Anglicans. As, I may add, it would, I believe, be even more widely and more readily acknowledged could our friends rid themselves of a confusion as to primacy and supremacy which seems to obsess them.

But the admission, whether partial or complete, places them, as it were, on the very threshold of their goal and leaves but one step more, the last and hardest, to be taken—submission to an authority which they recognize as of God's ordering and appointment, direct or indirect, to which, as they see ever more clearly, the "Provinces of York and Canterbury," as their very titles show, were unquestionably and undeniably subject in spirituals from St. Augustine to Archbishop Warham. It brings us, also, to the conclusion of this introductory study of the movement, for the inadequacy and discursiveness of which I crave the reader's kind indulgence. I will only add as one last word that, as might have been expected, other doctrines have become more clearly understood and more firmly held in consequence of this fuller realization of all that the assumed position and claims of Anglicanism involve. Not least of these, surely, we may count a growing devotion to Our Blessed Lady and the saints and to the holy souls in Purgatory. Belief in the Real Presence of Our Divine Lord in the sacrament of His love—a Presence which they believe their imperfect rite assures to them—has kept pace with ritual development, as it has been its one reason and justification. We have, therefore, a religious body conscious not merely of a corporate existence and of its assumed past history, which is much, but also which is ever and increasingly more conscious in great and growing measure of the obligations which its asserted position and claims involve. There are still "schools of thought" in the Anglican communion—Low, Broad, High and "Catholic," even to "Anglo-Roman"—but the very Low Churchmen are tending, as was said, to "churchliness," and the Broad Churchmen, as has been also said, to a less blatant, if more modernist anti-ritualistic attitude, while High Churchmen are more than ever disposed to support the "extreme wing" against any attempt by the State to regulate doctrines or practices and to prefer, with the "Anglo-Roman," Papal autocracy to parliamentary tyranny. "If the State touches the extreme men it touches us," said one of this school to me some years ago; "and for every priest deprived for using incense," he added, "a dozen who never used it before will begin doing so." Of the Anglo-Romans, the Reunionists by submission, it was my privilege to write in the former article[2] already referred to. Altogether the reader will, I think, agree with the contention that no religious movement in the history of Christendom—I speak advisedly—was ever more worthy of sympathetic, prayerful interest and study than this strange and wonderful counter-reformation.

FRANCIS W. GREY.

Ottawa, Ontario.

---

[2] AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1909.

SCIENTISTS AND FAITH.

AFTER the death of Lord Kelvin some two years ago, it was pointed out in nearly every one of the numerous sketches of his career that appeared in periodicals, scientific as well as popular, that in spite of the supposed opposition between science and faith, Lord Kelvin had always been a faithful adherent of formal religious ideas and his philosophy of life had always made room not only for a belief in Providence and a hereafter, but for revelation in a much more extended sense. He had often proclaimed that life was enlarged and completed by faith in the things beyond sense that one sees here but darkly. Far from thinking that progress in science had undermined the value of the old arguments for the existence of a beneficent Creator and an overruling Providence, Lord Kelvin thought and declared that "science proves the existence of a Creator." He did not share at all the ideas of those who seemed to think that because there has been a reaction against the frivolities of exaggerated teteology, therefore the proof of the existence of God by the argument from design has lost its force. In his address as the president of the forty-first annual session of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Edinburgh, nearly forty years ago, he said: "Overpoweringly strong proofs of intelligence and benevolent design lie all around us; and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific, turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing us through nature the influence of a free will and teaching us that all living beings depend on one ever-acting Creator and Ruler."

Nor must it be thought that Lord Kelvin's views in this matter had changed as he grew older or as the more modern scientific ideas gained vogue. Within five years of his death in moving a vote of thanks for a lecture given at University College, London, Lord Kelvin not only practically repeated what he had said thirty-five years before at Edinburgh, but even emphasized his position in the matter. A report of his remarks, which was subsequently acknowledged by Lord Kelvin to be substantially correct in a letter in which he asked that certain expressions be modified, appeared in the London *Times* for May 2, 1904. In this he is declared to have said that "science positively affirmed creative power. Science made every one feel a miracle in himself. There was nothing between absolute scientific belief in creative power and the acceptance of the theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. Was there," he asked, "anything so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms by falling together of their own accord could make a sprig of moss, a microbe a living animal? As for himself, he felt bound to come to the conclusion that science was not antagonistic to religion, but a help for it."

It is sometimes supposed that in such expressions, as far as scientists are concerned, Lord Kelvin stands almost alone; that he is at best one of a very small group of men distinguished in science whose conservatism is so great that it has kept them from being swept away by the inevitable stream of scientific tendency which is so surely taking men from old-time beliefs. For it is now considered almost a truism to say that scientists are, as it were, perforce unbelievers. There is a very definite impression that science and faith are inalterably opposed to one another. Many quote with confident assent Herbert Spencer's expression: "Of all antagonism of belief, the oldest, the widest, the most profound and the most important is that between religion and science." That this antagonism should exist seems to many people quite inevitable. When it is pointed out to them that a scientist like Lord Kelvin sees none of it, the response is likely to be that he is, after all, the exception which proves the rule, and the very fact that his state of mind in this matter has been emphasized so much is only additional evidence for the very common existence of that opposition between science and faith which only by chance did not exist in his case.

This persuasion that most scientists have either lost their beliefs or have had their faith in a Creator, in Providence and in a hereafter of reward and punishment seriously impaired by their preoccupation with science, is not hard to understand. Many of the popular writers in science in our time, those who have had the ear of the people in scientific matters, have been quite ready to proclaim this state of things. Since they were accepted as authorities in science, it was only to be expected that their opinion in this supposedly cognate matter should also carry weight. The absolute contradiction of this opinion, however, can be readily shown, and practically all the supremely great men in science of the nineteenth century, of the end as well as of the beginning of it, were firm believers and indeed many of them were devoutly religious men. From a consideration of the circumstances it is evident that smaller minds may become so engrossed with the principles of science as to lose their convictions in matters of faith; the greater minds, however, find no such difficulty, but, on the contrary, like Lord Kelvin, have their faith broadened and deepened by their scientific knowledge.

It is rather difficult to discuss satisfactorily the relations of science and faith in the abstract. The conclusion as to whether there is an inevitable and unending antagonism between science and faith depends largely on the point of view of the person who discusses this question. With regard to the concrete problem, however, the relations of scientists to faith, it is perfectly easy to reach definite conclusions on solid bases of fact. It does not depend at all on the point of view, but is strictly a matter of biography. The relation of science and faith constitute, if not a metaphysical problem, at least an intellectual question that cannot be settled by inductive reasoning. It is entirely a matter for deduction. Scientists have grown impatient of deduction in recent years. Since it is they, however, in the sense of men who are mainly interested in physical science, who insist on this antagonism of faith and science, the methods of physical science, especially the inductive method, should prevail in its discussion. The only way to apply these is by getting at the relations of scientists and faith. Just as soon as this is attempted all question of antagonism disappears. As we have already said, the greatest scientists in practically every department of recent science have been the firmest believers.

This is no mere assertion founded on a few scattered examples, but, on the contrary, represents the true story of the position of scientists in this matter very thoroughly. There is not a single department of nineteenth century science in which the representative discoverers were not faithful believers. Of course, this is true in astronomy, for an unbelieving astronomer is almost a contradiction in terms. At the very opposite pole of science, however, in medicine, usually considered so skeptical in its tendencies that the proverb runs, "Where there are three phyiscians there are two atheists," the rule with regard to great scientists being faithful believers holds quite as firmly. Morgagni, the father of pathology; Auenbrugger, the father of physical diagnosis; Galvani, the founder of medical electricity; Laennec, who laid the foundation of our knowledge of pulmonary diseases; Johann Müller, the father of modern German medicine; Schwann, the father of the cell doctrine; Claude Bernard, the great pioneer in modern physiology; Pasteur, the father of modern bacteriology; Jenner and Louis and Graves and Stokes and Corrigan, and any number more, were all of them believers and, indeed, the great majority of them devout Catholics.

Some of the developments of this assertion make rather startling reading, in view of the usual impressions. There are phrases and phases of the lives of these men that bring out very clearly their attitude to the things of faith. Of Morgagni's ten living children, eight daughters became religious and one of his sons became a Jesuit. Over and over again he declared his happiness that they had "chosen the better part." All of the great pathologist's philosophy of life is revealed by that phrase, but if more evidence of his faith were needed, it could be had abundantly, for Morgagni, one of the most widely known of scientists in his time in Europe, was, as might be judged from the family conditions mentioned, a most devout Catholic, the friend and adviser of four Popes. Galvani, his great contemporary, was of very like character. Alibert, the secretary general of the French Medical Society of Emulation, in his address on Galvani in 1801, quoted Galvani's well-known expression "that small draughts of philosophy lead to atheism, but longer draughts bring one back to God." *"Breves haustus in philosophia ad atheismum ducunt, longiores autem reducunt ad Deum."* This was at the beginning of the century. At the close of it Pasteur, who perhaps did more for medical science than any other single man during the nineteenth century, declared that he was convinced that if he knew as much as he could know, he would have the faith of a Breton peasant; if he knew all that there was to know, he would have the faith of a Breton peasant woman. Over the entrance of his tomb at the Pasteur Institute is his beautiful confession of faith: "Happy the man who bears within him a divinity, an ideal of beauty and obeys it; an ideal of art, an ideal of science, an ideal of country, an ideal of the virtues of the Gospel." In the address before the French Academy, from which this confession is taken, there follow immediately two further sentences worthy to be recalled: "These are the living springs of great thought and great action. Everything grows clear in the reflections from the infinite."

Midway between Galvani and Pasteur had come the great father of modern German medicine, Johann Müller. As a young man he once said: *"Nemo psychologus nisi physiologus"*—No one can be a psychologist unless he is a physiologist. How often has this been perverted in the years that followed into a declaration that for Müller psychology was merely a branch of physiology—that mental operations were a function of the brain, and nothing more. All that he meant was that if one were to know psychology well in the sense of being an expert psychologist, one must needs be a physiologist. This was the farthest in the world from saying that psychic actions were entirely dependent on the brain and that mental operations were merely mechanical. As a matter of fact, far from being a materialist, as the perverted explanation of his expression might imply, Müller was all his life a faithful Catholic. In spite of all the influences against such a thing in Protestant Berlin, Müller continued to practice the religion in which he had been born in the Rhineland, and after his death in Berlin he was taken with great pomp for burial among his Catholic relatives and the brother Catholics of his native Coblentz erected the monument over him.

PHYSICISTS AND FAITH.

Very probably the science that would be generally conceded as typically belonging to the nineteenth century is that which has gathered around the subject of electricity. Most of its development has come practically in the last hundred years, and the lives of the men who made it are not so far from us but that we know much about their characters and philosophy of life, apart from their scientific studies. Most of these electrical discoverers were men of profound intellect and broad interests. None of them were narrow specialists in their own line, as, indeed, great discoverers in science seldom are. Most of them had devoted themselves to determining for themselves as far as was possible the meaning of the universe, to the question of their relations to their Creator and to their fellowman, as well as to an overruling Providence and to the problem of a hereafter. With that same depth of intellect and power of mental concentration that enabled them to go beyond the bounds of the knowledge of physical science hitherto attained by men they applied themselves to these great philosophic problems. The answers they found after mature deliberation represent, if anything does, the real relation of scientists to faith. The question of the antagonism of science and faith can be settled at once by the inductive method by enumerating the opinions of these supreme scientific thinkers who were all of them men of philosophic breadth of intellect, not followers of others' opinions, but original thinkers, whose discoveries as a rule were principles in science that applied far beyond their immediate significance in electricity.

One may pass by Franklin for the moment, because though there never was a more profoundly practical philosopher in his views of the meaning of life and of the universe, his habit of proverb-making for the public has sometimes made his expressions seem rather meant to catch the popular mind than to express Franklin's own deepest convictions. This surely would not be said, however, of the epitaph which he composed for himself and which in its humorous symbolism expressed his act of faith in a very striking way: "The body of Benjamin Franklin, Printer (like the cover of an old book, its contents torn out and stript of its lettering and gilding), lies here, food for worms. But the work shall not be lost, for it will (as he believed) appear once more in a new and more elegant edition, revised and corrected by the author."

After Franklin came Galvani, who was at once a medical and an electrical scientist, a discoverer in both fields, almost as great in comparative anatomy as in medical electricity. We have already quoted the well-known expression which can perhaps be best paraphrased in English by Pope's famous lines:

A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep or touch not the Pierian spring.

It is but one of many expressions that might be quoted from Galvani, for he was a deep believer and a fervent Catholic. Scarcely more need be said of him than that, after having given an example of unselfishness in the following of conscience that was almost heroic, Galvani asked at the end of a life that had been spent freely in every way for others in need, that he should be buried in the habit of St. Francis of Assisi, because he belonged to the Third Order of Franciscans and considered his membership in the family of "the little poor man of God" as of more significance to him at that ultimate moment than the honorary memberships in scientific societies which had come to him as a consequence of his discoveries in electricity.

Of Galvani's great contemporary in electrical science, his fellow-countryman, Volta, it would be a waste of words to dilate on his ideas of the relations of science and faith, since he himself deliberately made his declaration of opinion for his own generation and posterity. The distinguished discoverer in electricity, having heard it said that he continued to practice his religion mainly because he did not want to offend his friends nor scandalize his neighbors, and above all did not want the poor folk around him to be led by his example into giving up what he knew to be their most fruitful source of consolation in the trials of life, answered this unjust suspicion by deliberately writing out his confession of faith. He said: "If some of my faults and negligencies may have by chance given occasion to some one to suspect me of infidelity, I am ready as some reparation for this and for any other good purpose to declare to such a one and to every other person and on every occasion and under all circumstances, that I have always held and hold now the holy Catholic religion as the only true and infallible one, thanking without end the good God for having gifted me with such a faith, in which I firmly propose to live and die, in the lively hope of attaining eternal life. I recognize my faith as a gift of God, a supernatural faith; I have not on this account, however, neglected to use all human means that could confirm me more and more in it, and that might drive away any doubt which could arise to tempt me in matters of faith. I have studied my faith with attention as to its foundation, reading for this purpose books of apologetics as well as those written with a contrary purpose, and trying to appreciate the arguments pro and contra. I have tried to realize from what sources spring the strongest arguments which render faith most credible to natural reason and such as cannot fail to make every well balanced mind which has not been perverted by vices or passion to embrace it and love it. May this protest of mine, which I have deliberately drawn up and which I leave to posterity, subscribed with my own hand and which shows to all and every one that I do not blush at the Gospel—

may it, as I have said, produce some good fruit." (Signed at Milan, January 6, 1815, Alessandro Volta.)

When Volta wrote this he was not in his dotage, but, on the contrary, was in the full maturity of his power, not yet sixty years of age, and for the next decade he was looked up to as one of the greatest scientists of Europe and as one of the most profoundly original thinkers of his time. Indeed, he had shown by important discoveries and original investigations of great value in many departments of physical science that his was one of the exceptional intellects in the history of mankind. His confession of faith then must be taken as his well weighed declaration of what he thought were the relations of science and faith. Far from finding any antagonism between his science and his faith, he had only to report complete harmony. Far from science having disturbed his faith, he seems rather to think that it had strengthened it and that the little additional knowledge that he had picked up on the shores of the infinite had only served to make him appreciate better the depths of his ignorance, yet how much that ignorance could be supplied for an defective knowledge complemented by faith.

The same story holds for all of these distinguished discoverers in electricity, even for those who were not brought up under the influence of the Catholic Church. The next great name after that of Volta in electricity is Oersted, the Danish physicist who demonstrated the identity between magnetism and electricity by showing that a current of electricity influenced a magnetic needle. Oersted had made Christian philosophy a subject of special study. This had been done without at all interfering with his devotion to science. He had come to be looked upon as one of the supreme leaders in physical science in Europe. He occupied for the first half of the nineteenth century very nearly the same position that Lord Kelvin did during the latter half, and he counted among his friends all the distinguished men of science of the time. When he attended scientific congresses in Germany or in England he was received with distinguished courtesy and given the highest honors. He had been chosen an honorary member of practically all the important scientific societies of Europe. His fame as a discoverer in electricity is due not to a single accidental observation, but to the thorough work which he did in every department of the physical sciences relating to electricity.

The opinion of a man like this, especially if pronounced not when he was young, but after he had had long experience of life and had sounded all the depths of science and philosophy, should be worth while considering. Like Volta, Oersted not only found no antagonism between science and faith, but, on the contrary, he was of the opinion that the more he knew of science, the greater was his faith. For those who have accepted the modern idea of the incompatibility of faith and science it would indeed be interesting to read his address on "The Cultivation of Science, Considered as an Exercise of Religion." One of the passages from this expresses his opinion very thoroughly. At the time when he delivered this address he was a man of about forty years of age.

"If my purpose here was merely to show that science necessarily engenders piety, I should appeal to the great truth everywhere recognized that the essence of all religion consists in love towards God. The conclusion would then be easy that love of Him from whom all truth proceeds must create the desire to acknowledge truth in all her paths; but as we desire here to recognize science as a religious duty, it will be requisite for us to penetrate deeper into its nature. It is obvious, therefore, that the searching eye of man, whether he regards his own inward being or the creation surrounding and encompassing him, is always led to the Eternal Source of all things. In all inquiry the ultimate aim is to discover that which really exists, and to contemplate in its pure light apart from all that deceives the careless observer by only a seeming existence. The philosopher will then comprehend what, amidst ceaseless change, is the constant and uncreated which is hidden behind unnumbered creations, the bond of union which causes things not to fall apart in spite of their manifold division and separations. He must soon acknowledge that the dependent can only be the constant and the constant the independent, and that true unity is inseparable from either of these. And thus it is in the nature of thought that it finds no quiet resting place, no pause except in the Invariable, Eternal, Uncaused, All-causing, All-comprehensive Omniscience."[1]

Twenty years later, when Oersted was a man of sixty and had risen from the position of an enthusiastic investigator in science whose original genius was as yet known only to a few to that of the dean of physical science in his time, his opinion with regard to the relations of science and faith had not varied, and indeed seems only to have been emphasized by his further scientific studies, his great discoveries and his relations with other great men of science in Europe. In the address on "The Relation of Natural Science to Various Important Religious Subjects," delivered about 1840, he said: "If we view God as that Essence of whose being we must be convinced by our own essence, we must then bear in mind that the former as much as the latter is an entire living Being, though in every respect infinitely more glorious. From Him we receive through the whole of existence innumerable influences; but our conviction of this springs from the intellectual faculties of our nature. By the hidden power of all these united efforts the knowledge of God is awakened within us. Some people have such a strong internal life of reason that this consciousness is very easily excited; most people require many and powerful means of excitement; to these belong communications from other independent beings. Were such only believed as communications, a faith upon authority would alone be produced which is almost useless to our rational existence; but if these communications awake those hidden faculties of the mind which are adapted to faith, so that these are developed into a lively consciousness of God and the consequent endeavor to live in God, then this faith would never be designated a faith upon authority. When our reason, acting with consciousness, endeavors with all its powers to comprehend the connection between the actions of the God we believe in and all that is effected, a force and a clearness of conviction proceeds from it, by which, as I might say, faith is changed into knowledge."[2]

---

[1] "Oersted Soul in Nature," Bohn's Library, p. 135.

After Oersted the next most important discoverer in electricity, who, indeed, took Oersted's ideas and within a week after their announcement developed them to a new significance, is Ampere. There is no doubt that in his time he was one of the greatest of living scientists. He was honored as such by most of the distinguished scientific societies of Europe. He was a broad-minded, profound thinker in the highest sense of the word, and though an untiring experimentalist, seems at times to have almost had an intuition into the process of nature. Of his attitude towards faith it is scarcely necessary to speak, since he is so well known to have been a devout Catholic. In the midst of his scientific studies Ozanam tells how he used occasionally to take his broad forehead between his hands and say: "How great is God, Ozanam! How great is God, and how little is our knowledge!" Sainte-Beuve in his introduction to Ampere's "Essay on the Philosophy of the Sciences" (Paris, 1843), says: "The religious struggles and doubts of his earlier life had ceased. During the years which followed up to the time of his death we were all filled with wonder and admiration at the way in which without effort he united religion and science, faith and confidence in the intellectual possibilities of man with adoring submission to the revealed word of God."

On the evidence of his greatest contemporaries in science, probably the greatest experimental scientist that ever lived was Michael Faraday, the English physicist of the first half of the nineteenth century. Usually it is experimental science that is said to be opposed to faith. The attitude of mind which enables a man to accept things on faith is proclaimed to be definitely antagonistic to that doubting spirit which enables a man to reject explanations of phenomena that have satisfied his predecessors and contemporaries and set himself to finding new solutions for old problems. Indeed, it is usually declared to have been because of this inevitable tendency to skepticism that the Catholic Church is said to have opposed experimental science almost down to our own time. The lives of the great experimentalists of the Middle Ages, Roger Bacon, Albertus Magnus and many others, form the complete answer to this, but Faraday's opinion with regard to the relation of science to faith has an added interest, because of all that has been said of the relation of faith and experimentalism. He did not often obtrude the faith that was so deep in his mind into his scientific lectures. As he himself once said: "I do not speak of God here, not because of lack of faith, but because I am engaged with other subjects." At times, however, his superabundant faith led him to express his profound belief in a Creator and in the evident proof of His existence, which the material world furnished him. In his more familiar lectures to the cadets at Woolwich, he more than once hinted at these elevated thoughts. It is from one of these that the following passage, which shows his attitude in the matter very well, is gleaned:

---

[2] "Oersted Soul in Nature" (Bohn), p. 185.

"When I consider the multitude of associated forces which are diffused through nature, when I think of that calm and tranquil balancing of their energies which enables elements most powerful in themselves, most destructive to the world's creatures and economy, to dwell associated together and be made subservient to the wants of creation, I rise from the contemplation more than ever impressed with the wisdom, the beneficence and grandeur beyond our language to express, of the Great Disposer of all."

Faraday, of course, is well known to have been a devout believer. His belief, however, was founded in a deeply philosophic spirit. He once said: "I have never seen anything incompatible between those things of man which are within him and those higher things concerning his future which he cannot know but by the spirit. Therefore," he added, "our philosophy, while it shows us these things, should lead us to think of Him who wrought them, for it is said by an authority even far above that which these works present that the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his external power also a divinity."

After Faraday the most important name in electrical science is that of George Simon Ohm, after whom the unit of electrical resistence has been so deservedly named. Professor George Chrystal, of Edinburgh, in his article on "Electricity" in the Encyclopedia Britannica, ninth edition, reëchoing the expressions of his English colleagues, says that Ohm's law must now be allowed to rank with the law of gravitation and the elementary laws of statical electricity as a *law of nature* in the strictest sense. It was not alone in electricity, however, that Ohm did remarkable original work. A law in acoustics is also named after him, and Helmholtz confessed that some of his own best work was founded on original observations made by his great contemporary. Besides Ohm accomplished some fine work in the theory of light and colors, and though he was anticipated in this, was quite as original, so far as he was concerned, as in any other of his observations and conclusions in other departments of physic.

There is no doubt then that Ohm had one of the most marvelously original minds of all those who devoted themselves to the physics has been illuminated by his work. He had the wonderful physics has been illuminted by his work. He had the wonderful faculty of taking a complex problem, eliminating all the unknown factors from it but one or two, simplifying it to the last degree and then solving it in such a way as to reach a great expression of new truth. To have done this in electricity, in acoustics and in optics is an achievement that stamps him as a man of surpassing penetration of mind. The opinion of such a man with regard to the relations of science and faith and his own personal attitude towards faith is well worth while knowing in this inquiry that we are conducting, since he was acknowledged to be one who never expressed himself until he had thoroughly analyzed the question under consideration, and who had always satisfied himself as to the grounds for his opinion before he gave it.

There happens to be a very interesting incident in Ohm's life which furnished him with the opportunity for expressing very forcibly his belief in Providence and in the overruling wisdom which somehow cares for things in life and orders them to its own good ends, though we little mortals may not be able to appreciate just what those ends are. He had taken up the investigation of puzzling phenomena of interferences of light which are so rich in form and color, and succeeded in finding a formula of great simplicity which covered all the individual colors. It was only after he had reached his conclusions and was actually publishing his results that Ohm found that he had been anticipated by Professor Langberg, of Christiana, in Norway, with regard to the principal points of his investigation. When his attention was called to this, Ohm was ready and willing at once to acknowledge the priority of Professor Langberg and to give him all the credit that belonged to his discovery. For his own wasted work he said just a word that shows his readiness to submit to the will of Providence, confident that all things are ordered well. "I know not whether I should consider it lucky or unlucky that the extremely meritorious work of Langberg should have entirely escaped me and should have been lost to general recollection. Certain it is that if I had had the knowledge of it before, my present investigations, which were occasioned by this ellipse system, would not have been made and I would have been spared a deal of work. In that case, however, a number of other and scarcely less important scientific principles would have remained hidden for the time being at least. Under the circumstances, the profound truth of the old proverb, 'Man proposes, but God disposes,' has been brought home to me again. What originally set me investigating this subject now proves to be without interest for science, since the problem has been solved before. On the other hand, a number of things of which I had no hint at all at the beginning of my researches have come to take its place and compensate for it."

There is probably not a more simple, humble recognition of man's dependence of the will of the Almighty in all the history of science than this passage from Ohm's preface to his monograph on light interferences.

At the end of the nineteenth century the physical scientists whose work in electricity distinguished them above their fellows occupied the same standpoint with regard to faith as their great predecessors at the beginning of the century. We have already discussed Lord Kelvin as a typical example, but quite as striking a type of the recent leader in electrical science was Clerk Maxwell, who died in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and who was looked up to as probably the greatest living mathematical physicist of his time. One of his expressive sayings which shows very strikingly the relation of the scientist to faith has been often repeated. It was used toward the end of his life and when he was in the very maturity of his powers, about the age of fifty. "I have looked into most philosophical systems," he said, "and I have seen that none will work without a God." There are many other expressions, however, more nearly related to his special scientific work which bring out his idea of the relations of science and faith quite as emphatically as this. Probably no one in the nineteenth century speculated with such profound suggestiveness as to the constitution of matter as Clerk Maxwell. If his conclusions with regard to matter receive favorable acceptance, surely his reflections with regard to man's relation to the world and to the Creator should carry their weight also.

Like all the other scientists whom we have mentioned, Clerk Maxwell had given much time and thought to these subjects. This is, indeed, the striking difference between the scientist who rejects faith and talks of the antagonism between science and faith and the greater scientist who fails to find any such opposition. The great discoverers have given much time to the consideration of the problems of the relations of faith to science. The lesser scientist has either not had the time or has refused to consider the subject. For him on first principles there can be nothing gained by the devotion of time to those subjects which cannot be satisfactorily settled on scientific principles. He refuses, therefore, to consider them. This does not make him hesitate, however, to express his opinion as to the inappeasible conflict that must exist between science and faith. Clerk Maxwell, assuming a very different attitude in this matter, had, as in science, first investigated and then come to his conclusion. He once declared: "I have read up many queer religions; there is nothing like the old thing after all." In this subject, as in everything else, he first informed himself and then drew his conclusions. Unlike those who refuse to have anything to do with religion, he had studied the subject deeply, and the result was devout attention to religious duties and to charity that made him a model for all those who were close to him. A clergyman friend on terms of intimacy with him, said: "His illness drew out the whole heart and soul and spirit of the man. He had gauged and fathomed all the schemes and systems of philosophy and had found them utterly empty and unsatisfying (unworkable was his own word about them), and he turned with simple faith to the Gospel of the Saviour."

It is no wonder that we have from a man of this kind some memorable paragraphs that bear distinctly on the relations of science to faith. We have said that his speculations on the composition of matter are probably the most fruitful for science that have ever been made. His reflections on the molecules show distinctly how his scientific work was strengthening and deepening his faith. "94. They (the atoms) continue this day as they were created, perfect in number and measure and weight, and from the ineffaceable character impressed on them we may learn that those aspirations after accuracy in measurement, truth in statement and justice in action, which we reckon among our noblest attributes as men, are ours because they are essential constituents of the image of Him who in the beginning created, not only the heaven and the earth, but the materials of which heaven and earth consist."

His long application to the problems involved in the composition of matter naturally led him to thoughts with regard to its origin, and these as a natural consequence to the question of the Creator. As a climax of the consideration of the relation of science to faith and the emphatic confirmation of Lord Kelvin's expression that science teaches the necessity for a Creator, Clerk Maxwell's conclusion with regard to the formation of the molecule and the coming into existence of matter as we know it, are extremely interesting. Near the end of his article on the atom in the third volume of the Encyclopedia Brittanica, ninth edition, he said: "The formation of the molecule is therefore an event not belonging to that order of nature under which we live. It is an expression of a kind which is not, so far as we are aware, going on on earth or in the sun or the stars, either now or since these bodies began to be formed. It must be referred to the epoch, not of the formation of the earth or of the solar system, but of the establishment of the existing order of nature itself, and till not only these worlds and systems, but the very order of nature itself is dissolved, we have not reason to expect the occurrence of any operation of a similar kind.

"In the present state of science, therefore, we have strong reasons for believing that in a molecule, or if not in a molecule, in one of its component atoms, we have something which has existed either from eternity or at least from times anterior to the existing order of nature. But besides this atom there are immense numbers of other atoms of the same kind, and the constants of each of these atoms are incapable of adjustment by any process now in action. Each is physically independent of all the others.

"Whether or not the conception of a multitude of beings existing from all eternity is in itself self-contradictory, the conception becomes palpably absurd when we attribute a relation of quantitative equality to all these things. We are then forced to look beyond them to some common cause or common origin to explain why this singular relation of equality exists rather than any one of the infinite number of possible relations of inequality.

"Science is incompetent to reason upon the creation of matter itself out of nothing. We have reached the utmost limit of our thinking faculties when we have admitted that, because matter cannot be eternal and self-existent, it must have been created."

BIOLOGISTS AND FAITH.

The impression with regard to the opposition between science and faith has really arisen more from the popularization of biological science than from any other source. It is the modern biologists particularly who have followed in the train of Herbert Spencer in proclaiming the antagonism of faith and science. Before the general acceptance of the theory of evolution, for it is as yet only a theory in science, and there are even distinguished professors of the biological sciences who insist on teaching it as such, there were many beliefs, as that in special creations, that obtained wide credence supposedly as a matter of religion, but really as deductions from certain religious principles. With the rejection of these in the advance of biological science there came a tottering of the structure of faith in many minds. The removal of these extraneous additions has, however, no more seriously disturbed the edifice of faith itself than the periodical sweeping away of the temporary market buildings from around the mediaeval Cathedral disturbed the main edifice, though it does for the moment change quite markedly the appearance that has been familiar even to those who have known it best.

As a matter of fact, in biology, as in the other sciences, the greatest thinkers have been the least given to materialism, and it is only once more as in physical science, the popularizers of science who have been prone to emphasize the supposed contradictions of science and faith, and reiterate the inevitable opposition that to their minds must exist between the two forms of assent for these coördinate departments of human knowledge. The real father of nineteenth century evolution is, of course, not Darwin, but Lamarck. Lamarck just on the eve of the nineteenth century outlined completely a theory of evolution. He did so after having devoted fifty years of his life to scientific research in biology. His theory of evolution was complete in every way. He even insisted on the probability of spontaneous generation. He suggested the evolution of plants and animals from a single germ and the development of man from the ape, yet proclaimed his firm conviction that all this evolution had taken place because it had been willed by the Author of all things and because that was the way that He manifested His power.

Before quoting the passage that proclaims his faith in the Creator, founded on his scientific researches, it may be well to recall that Lamarck himself died a Catholic and probably never at any time in his life had been far from complete belief in Catholic doctrines.

His most recent biographer, Professor Packard, late professor of zoölogy and geology in Brown University, Providence, R. I., in his "Life of Lamarck" has other quotations which show how strongly Lamarck felt not only the necessity for the action of a Creator, but also for his creation of an order of things with laws that would lead to the regulation of the universe so that all things might move in orderly manner. "There is then," Lamarck said, "for the animals as for the plants, an order which belongs to nature and which results, as also the objects which this order makes exist from the power which it has received from the Supreme Author of all things. She is herself on the general and unchangeable order that this Sublime Author has created throughout, and only the totality of the general and special laws to which this order is subject. By these means, whose use it continues without change, it has given and will perpetually give existence to its productions; it varies and renews them unceasingly and thus everywhere preserves the whole order which is the result of it.

"Nature, that immense totality of different beings and bodies in every part of which exists an eternal circle of movements and changes regulated by law; totality alone unchangeable, so long as it pleases its Sublime Author to cause its existence, should be regarded as a whole, constituted by its parts, for a purpose which its author alone knows, and not exclusively for any one of them."

In his "Philosophia Zoölogic," published in 1809, when he was a man about sixty-five years of age (he lived to be over eighty), Lamarck said: "Surely nothing exists except by the will of the Sublime Author of all things. But can we not assign Him laws in the execution of His will and determine the method which He has followed in this respect? Has not an infinite power enabled Him to create an order of things which has successively given existence to all that we see as well as to that which exists and that of which we have no knowledge? As regards the decrees of this infinite wisdom, I have confined myself to the limits of a simple observer of nature."

After all, while it is generally not remembered, Darwin expressed himself in almost these same words in the closing sentences of his "Origin of Species." He said: "There is a grandeur in the view of life with its several powers having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, while this planet has gone circling on according to the fixed law of gravity from so simple a beginning, endless forms, most beautiful and most wonderful, have been and are being evolved."

Darwin is said to have withdrawn from this position later on in life and to have his faith seriously disturbed with regard to the question of Providence in the world by the existence of so much suffering and evil. He had dwelt so much on the struggle for life apparently without realizing that mutual aid which the animals exhibit by a wonderful instinct utterly inexplicable, except as a teteological quality plays quite as important a rôle in the preservation of the species. This dwelling on the struggle for life and the suffering and death which it involves has been the stumbling block of biologists generally and has done more to produce a tradition of the supposed opposition of faith and biological science than almost anything else. This is extremely unfortunate because it is exactly this phase of life that biology is prone to exaggerate the significance and importance of.

Emile Faguet, of the Academie Francais, writing in his "Propos Litteraires on Ernest Haeckel," fifteen years ago, suggested that "biology is precisely the science of evil on the earth. Life is a struggle. It is then the science of objection to the Deity. A good method," he adds, "of thinking of God is precisely not to think about life in the world." It was Kant who said there are two proofs of the existence of God. The contemplation of the starry heavens and the contemplation of the law of duty within the heart of man, that is to say, one can found religion on the inanimate universe on the one hand, or on the other on the moral nature of man. Between these two poles, so distant one from another, there is life—life properly so-called; life which is life, but which is not as yet moral life. It is this that Kant seems to advise us not to consider too much. And in reality we must recognize that the contemplation of life only with difficulty inspires religious thought. It does not engender religion, alas, but rather gives rise to melancholy. I doubt whether the religion of nature will ever become the religion of humanity.

M. Faguet has in this passage struck the keynote of the difficulties that have arisen in the relations between modern science and faith. Biology and nature study have become the popular phases of science. These are not productive of deep religious thought, but because of their close relation to suffering and death in the world may lead to skepticism. For smaller minds they are prone to produce feelings rather of discouragement than of religious exaltation. Even here, however, as in all other departments of science, the really great minds rise above that materialism which their almost constant application to the suffering in life is so prone to suggest into the higher realms of the existence of a Creator and of a Providence that is gradually bringing about an evolution in living beings, so that somehow out of evil good is produced. The number of the devout believers among the great workers in biology far surpasses those who have been turned to materialism.

In spite of this supposedly strong tendency to unorthodoxy, Catholic investigators play an extremely important rôle in nineteenth century biology. Of course, this is to be expected in France, where the most distinguished scientists of the century have all been not only faithful, but devout Catholics. This is as true in biology as it is in any of the other sciences. Lamarck, whom we have already mentioned, occupies the important place of Father of the Evolution Theory at the beginning of the century; Pasteur fills the largest space in science at the end. In the intervening period there are such men as Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, who, when told that he was dying, said to his daughter: "We shall soon part, but soon we shall meet again;" and Claude Bernard, who at the height of his career as a scientist gave up his beliefs in religion, but came back to them later when in the maturity of his powers he was looked upon as one of the greatest of the living biological scientists.

What is true in France, however, is curiously enough true even in Protestant Germany, where not a few of the most prominent biologists remained faithful Catholics in the midst of their work.

The most important step in nineteenth century biological was the discovery of the cell doctrine. This was made by Theodore Schwann, who lived a long, active life, always the centre of interest in biological science, thoroughly respected by all his scientific colleagues, yet remained not only a faithful Catholic, but preferred, in spite of flattering offers from Protestant German universities, to teach at the Catholic Universities of Louvain and Liege, in order that he might be constantly among his own Catholic people. In the light of certain modern ideas as the opposition between biology and faith, it is extremely interesting to find that the first book on the cell theory, the foundation stone of recent biology, published by Schwann, was submitted to the Bishop of Malines and published with his imprimatur. Schwann's great teacher at Berlin, Johann Müller, was, as we have said, a Catholic, and though there is no doubt that few men have contributed so much to nineteenth century biology or laid the foundation of so many suggestive theories with regard to life and its significance, he found no opposition between his faith and his science.

Schwann's distinguished successor at the University of Louvain, Van Beneden, is another typical example of Catholicity, and the most profound acquaintance with biological science, running side by side in a long career without any interference with one another. Van Beneden was looked upon as one of the leaders in biological science in the latter half of the nineteenth century. His journal, *La Cellule,* came to be looked upon as one of the most authoritative organs of biological science. How little it insisted on the value of names for admission to its columns, rather than the significance of the contribution, may be best appreciated from the fact that the articles of the distinguished Spanish anatomist, Ramon y Cajal, first found a European audience through this journal. At that time the Spanish observer's reputation was yet to be made; his work was suspected, his conclusions scouted, yet eventually this proved to be the best work done in brain anatomy during the nineteenth century. Van Beneden was one of the broadest of scientists, ready to welcome every new suggestion or discovery that promised to add to knowledge, yet possessed of a thoroughly conservative critical faculty that enabled him to winnow the wheat from the chaff.

The year after Van Beneden's death, Carnoy's eulogium of Van Beneden appeared in the "Revue Des Questions Scientifique."[3] Carnoy thus summed up Van Beneden's science and faith: "By his numerous important discoveries Van Beneden had raised himself to the first rank in the scientific world. He represents for us especially the happy union of science and faith in the highest, sublimest degree. Van Beneden was fortunate indeed in his life; he practiced his religion with simplicity and conviction. In the precious hours when the scientist found himself on journeys there often came from his heart an ardent and devout prayer to God. When this great mind set forth the new discoveries and the many laws which had been revealed by his investigations he confessed that he often found light and help from his faith to enable him to understand the divinely created miracle of the animal world better."

---

[3] Vol. XXXVII., Brussels, 1819, p. 336.

Many of the great German workers in biology whose names are most familiar took pains to declare their attitude toward faith and how far any conclusions that they could derive from science were from the materialism toward which the lesser lights in science were so ready to proclaim they felt themselves impelled to. Quite a list of them might be made, and some of them were very emphatic in their declarations. Among them are included Ehrenberg, who did such distinguished work in microbiology when that science was beginning its modern days; Hyrtl, well known for original researches in anatomy and physiology; von Baer, the father of modern embryology and one of the great pioneers of the modern phase of biology; Von Martins, the botanist; Agassiz, whose work was begun in Switzerland and ended in America, and many others of lesser renown than these who are leaders each of them in their own department of the biological sciences.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the recent history of biology in what concerns this attitude of science to faith is to be found in the fact that a number of Catholic clergymen have been among the most distinguished workers and most successful investigators in this department of science.

Only in the last ten years have we come to realize it, but it is universally conceded that the greatest worker in the biological sciences during the latter half of the nineteenth century was the abbot of an Augustinian monastery at Brunn, in Moravia. Our biological journals are now filled with discussions of Mendel's works and Mendel's laws. Our biological investigators are mainly engaged in confirming and extending his observations on animals and plants; our biologists are mainly occupied with studying out the complete significance of his discoveries, and we have entered on the period of Mendelism to succeed Darwinism in biology. Of science and faith in Mendel's case there can be no doubt, though there is also no doubt of the depth of his knowledge of biological principle. After he had spent some ten years in the study of the plants in his monastery garden and elucidated problems that were to remain utterly obscure for a full generation after his time, because his work did not receive the attention that it deserved, he was elected the abbot of the monastery and spent the last fifteen years of his life in this position. His election was mainly due to the conviction of his brethren that he was a man of deep piety as well as profound learning, and he died almost in the odor of sanctity.

There are, however, many other Catholic churchmen who have reached noteworthy distinction in nineteenth century biological science. One of the best known of these is still alive—the Jesuit Father Wasmann, S. J., who is looked upon as one of the greatest of living etymologists, to whom we owe several articles on ants and their parasites, and who has described some nine hundred new species of insects, mainly ants and creatures that have relations to them. A number of the Catholic missionaries have attained distinguished names for their discoveries in foreign countries and for their collections in zoölogy and botany. The most distinguished of these was Father Armand, whose studies in zoölogy and botany in China made him famous throughout the world. He enriched the Jardin des Plantes in Paris so as to make it a Mecca for students from all over the world who wanted to know something about Chinese zoölogy and botany. Scarcely less distinguished was the Jesuit missionary, Father Peter Heude, who died at Shanghai in 1902. His articles on the conchology of China and his studies in the zoölogy of the Philippines, Batavia, the Celebes, the Moluccas and Japan attracted widespread attention. To this list should be added the names of Father Bernard Altum, some time president of the German Ornithological Society, whose book, "The Bird and Its Life," is widely known, and Father Latreille, one of the pioneer workers in etymology at the beginning of the nineteenth century, whose work was so successful that he is not likely to be forgotten. Nor are these all, none of whom found any hindrance to faith in his biological studies.

What has distinguished these believing biologists from their colleagues whose faith has grown less is that they have devoted time and attention to the study of the things of faith. As a rule scientists have failed to do this, usually because they refused to think that it would be worth their while; often because their absorption in scientific studies made them so one-sided in the intellectual interests that they did not appreciate the importance of these subjects for mankind and for themselves. Whenever scientists devote a reasonable amount of time to the things that in our present state of knowledge must be taken on faith, but we see them but darkly as through a glass, their faith suffers no eclipse. This is as true in biology as in any other of the sciences. The proof of it is to be found in the number of clergymen who have been biologists, and if further proof was needed, it would be found in the examples furnished by such men as Claude Bernard, in France, or Romanes, in England. While absorbed in science they were unbelievers. When the time came that they devoted more thought to religious subjects then their faith was restored to them.

Apparently it matters not what phase of the after life or of the other world scientists devote their attention to, they are sure to find evidence for belief that is quite sufficient to convince them, even though it may fail to carry convictions for others. The attitude of prominent scientists of our own day toward spiritualism is very interesting from this standpoint. Those who have given themselves unprejudiced to the investigation of the existence of the spirit world around us, interpenetrating and influencing our own, have come out of the investigation convinced of the existence of forces independent of matter, yet capable of influencing human life in certain ways. The converts to this state of mind among present day scientists have included such distinguished men as Alfred Russell Wallace, Sir William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, Professor Charles Richet, of Paris, and the late Professor Lombroso, of Turin. These men came to their conclusions not by deductive reasoning, but by the investigation of physical phenomena. They constitute the living proof that for the acceptance of a spirit world, what is needed is merely a readiness to admit the possibility of it and a willingness to accept such evidence as may be obtained.

THE FAITH OF SCIENTISTS.

In a word, the more one knows of the biographies of scientists, the less question is there of any opposition between science and faith. Just as soon as the relation of science and faith is taken out of the abstract, where there has been said to be so much antagonism, and put into the concrete, then there is no longer any question of opposition. Many scientists have lost their faith, but that has been because of neglect of the evidence for it or because of incapacity to appreciate that evidence. As a rule that has very few exceptions, the great scientists have given the time to this subject, and instead of losing their faith have had it strengthened by their devotion to science. The smaller minds among the scientists have made science an excuse for the loss of faith. Their little buckets of minds are apparently not capable of holding both science and faith, and science crowded its sister fount of knowledge out of mind because faith was of such little consequence to the possessor.

As a matter of fact, it is the scientists especially who have paid no attention to the things of faith who have not cared, or have been too preoccupied with the things of science to give the time to analyze the conditions on which faith exists, who have lost their faith. They have not had interest enough in such important questions as the existence of a Creator, of a Providence that overrules and a hereafter, with its inevitable reward and punishment, to realize that the difficulties of unbelief are infinitely more bothersome, infinitely less capable of seeing things than the doubts that accompany belief. Herbert Spencer told of having lost his interest in poetry. Darwin confessed that though in earlier years he had been much interested in the drama and music and art, he had lost these tastes completely in later life. It is easy to understand just how these losses came about. The two great English leaders of thought were so much occupied with other affairs that they lost their appreciation and their interest in certain beautiful manifestations of human intellectual life. If they are satisfied with the state of mind in which they find themselves after such losses, no one has any right to complain, for they are the only ones to suffer.

If because of their lack of interest and appreciation they themselves should set about persuading others (which, of course, they had too much sense to do) that these forms of æsthetic expression are trivial and mean much only to the unthoughtful and appeal only to the unlearned, their procedure would be quite unjustified and would, of course, be laughed at by the majority of men. If their disciples and readers, convinced by these expressions of lack of interest on the part of their masters, should proceed to denounce literature and poetry and music and art as trifling things, quite nugatory, over which men wasted time, but only because they had not developed out of a certain childishness in which such trifles were still of interest, then we would have a right to laugh at them. Just this sort of thing has happened, however, with regard to faith. Scientists who have neglected it have inevitably lost their taste for it and their comprehension of it, have failed to realize how much it means in life and how much it responds not merely to the intellect of men, but to his whole being, filling his aspirations, completing his purposes, lifting him out of himself and making life mean something where otherwise it would not. Of course, it is not such men that we should follow. Their opinion with regard to faith is worth no more than the opinion of men who confess they have no interest, that they have indeed lost their interest in æsthetics and with regard to human artistic expressions of all kinds.

The greatest scientists have taken the time, have had the abiding interest and, above all, have possessed the breadth and the depth of intellect which enabled them to realize the true place of philosophy and of faith in life, and so we have not had any cheap superficial material from them. Their acceptance of faith has not been because of tradition or merely because they have been brought up in certain beliefs. All of them deliberately weighed the evidence of faith for themselves with just the same calmness of intellect with which they weighed scientific evidences. This scrutiny of a thoroughly scientific mind, far from impairing faith, strengthened and deepened it and made it in nearly all these cases a great impulse for the bringing out of what was best in the men and their relations to their fellow-men.

It is this concrete side of this important question, the relations of our greatest scientists to faith, which constitutes the best lesson that the young can learn at the present time, when somehow there is a feeling in the air that science and faith may not be quite compatible and that it is a sign of largeness of intellect and breadth of mind to refuse to believe, and that it is only the narrow and the limited of intellect who have no knowledge of or but slight acquaintance with modern scientific progress who still keep their faith without serious misgivings. Just exactly the opposite is the truth. It is time that this false tradition with regard to science and faith, or, as I preferred to think of it, with regard to the faith of scientists, should be replaced by the direct conclusion from the facts of biography, as it can be so easily learned. Young men particularly have been led astray by this utterly false notion. It has seemed to them that they were exhibiting their largeness of mind and depth of knowledge in rejecting faith when they were really following the example of the mediocre minds in science. The opposite tradition, which is the true one, would make a magnificent safeguard for the young man during the years when he is so prone to think that he is thinking, though he is only following the leadership of some favorite writer or teacher. Horace's dictum with regard to the poets,

> Mediocribus esse poetis,
> Non Dii, non homines, non concessere columnae,

"Nor gods nor men, nor even the booksellers care for the mediocre poets," should be transferred to the scientists and paraphrased, for God nor man nor even the general public cares what the mediocre scientist thinks, above all, with regard to things that he has not paid much attention to.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York.

A SIDE OF CELTIC GENIUS.

THE boast of universal preëminence, of a leadership in every activity that the mind and hand of man can work upon, belongs to no single person or nation. A claim to partial greatness, to excellence in some line of genius, both the man or his race may graciously have without gainsay from his emulous neighbors; the world at large is not churlish and will acknowledge preëminent greatness wherever found. The Western marksman is first with the rifle, and the South Sea Islander with his boomerang; the poet may enjoy his flights of imagination, while others win plaudits by sailing machines a thousand feet above the earth; the peasantry of the Tyrol may walk their fields of faith in secure happiness, though some of the German universities are honored for their spurious rationalism, and the cantons of Switzerland may enjoy untrammeled national life, even though England ten years ago wrote this legend upon her postage stamp: "We hold a larger empire than has been;" or, again, though the American stamp should say what a noisy Yankee, like a true national braggadocio proposed when he read the English motto: "We can lick all creation." To every man and to every nation there is a foremost place in some department of thought or industry. The African is first of the human races if we look at them in alphabetical order.

A leadership in one activity of mind may, therefore, be conceded to Ireland, not that it is the only department in which her genius excels; indeed, to put the finger on the predominant mark of Celtic genius, so universal are its operations, would baffle the acutest analyst, and the same mark has not been touched upon twice by men who have attempted the task. Centuries ago one of them, a Gael, said in an old Irish poem:

For acuteness and valor, the Greeks;
For excessive pride, the Romans;
For dullness, the creeping Saxons;
For beauty and amorousness, the Gaels.

And only the other day we heard Mr. Chesterton's verdict: "Irishmen are best at the specially *hard* professions—the trades of iron, the lawyer, the soldier." The special activity of mind, therefore, that we are now conceding to Ireland is not claimed as her leading mark; it is only a side of her genius, and it is hers almost uniquely, a precious endowment for her people and a leaven for good beyond all human estimation in their exercise of it among the nations. It is this—to the Irish race the face of nature, whether in its simple charms or in its magnificent grandeur, is a wondrous book wherein great thoughts are read, true thoughts that enrich the mind and, more than that, the "understanding heart," with a wisdom surpassing mere academic knowledge. To the Celt every page of this marvelous volume is filled with living suggestiveness; up the mountains or along the vales, by the ocean strands and cliffs or in the woodlands near the rivers, in the vast reaches amid the stars or down with the humble cinquefoil hiding near the shamrock in the grass; through all the seasons, and in sunshine and in storm, the book is open to him always, like a vision to his eyes and a symphony to his sensitive heart. And the vision and the symphony are not left there motionless and dumb; they quicken the lips of the Celt to a psalm of praise, as should be, and as men of widom wrote, like Ecclesiasticus long ago, "Hath not the Lord made the saints to declare all His wonderful works which the Lord Almighty hath firmly settled to be established for His glory?"

In this lofty use of the scenes of the universe, with their revelations of God, the Celt is a leader, *facile princeps*. Nature in all her moods is an oracle to him, not mystifying as with the riddle of a sphinx, but clear-voiced and direct, simple as the first lessons of a child's book, yet with a depth of meaning that can engage the penetrating mind of a seer. It is not merely the intense delight that comes to every healthy-minded man at a vista or voice from this real fairyland; to the Celt it brings more than sensual charm; it is the gate and pathway to high thoughts and impulses. It does not circulate in his nerves as an emotional feeling; it is an elevation of his heart, an inspiration that tunes his lips to worshipful cadences before this terrestrial shrine of God. To Wordsworth, indeed, and to others of the gentiles who dwelt in the healthful country of solitude, intellectual and physical pleasure could come from field and forest; to them "the meanest flower that blows" could often give "thoughts that lie too deep for tears." But an element of their enjoyment was indefiniteness, and that fits not the Celtic mood. The message is clear to him, whether it comes from the quiet flower by the wall or from the loud torrent on the mountain; whether he dwell with the peaceful monk in his cloistered garden or stand by Lear in the raging storm upon the midnight heath.

We do not mean that the Celt in the expression of his praise, whether in prose or verse, will read out nature's lesson formally, in an appended corollary, as the moral that follows a fable in Esop. That was the manner of the Puritan, and especially of the early New England verse-makers in their Sabbath literature. The Celt is by instinct too artistic for such commonplaces, though he will at times, when the scene and the mood prompt it, break into direct praise of God, as Coleridge, a rare English example, did when he stood before the tremendous majesty of Mount Blanc and bade the mountain world to proclaim its lesson:

> Utter forth "God" and fill the hills with praise, . . .
> And tell the stars and tell yon rising sun,
> "Earth with her thousand voices praises God."

But the Celt's usual method is to let nature speak to him as a few verses from a Gospel. Then comes his meditation, and around the inspiring scene, as around the text of a preacher, the homily grows, and out of the picture comes a portion of the teaching that God put into it for men who have eyes and will see. Newman exhibits the Celtic method well in the "Second Spring"—the rebirth of vegetation in the springtime, the return of the carolling birds, the sowing of the seed again and the promise of the luxuriant summer and the fruitful autumn—and all this a symbolical background that illustrates the rebirth of God's Church in England.

This eloquence of the Celt in the school of nature is not of recent acquisition or development; it is contained in good quantity in what remains to us from the literary fragments that have survived the devastation of centuries. One authoritative statement,[1] with which all will agree who have looked into old Irish literature, is sufficient testimony for the ancient poets:

"Perhaps the most evident characteristic of Celtic bardic literature is the deep appreciation of nature in all her moods. No English poet that I know, with the possible exception of Wordsworth, and not even he with true Celtic inness, describes nature as we have it in the poems attributed to Oisin and Caolte. The English mind sees the reeds swaying in the wind, and the rainbow, and the mountain side flecked with cloud shadows and admires them; but the Celt, as it were, for the moment rides on the wings of the wind and is one with it. Having passed, as they say in the Highlands, under the pillars of Caershee, he is gifted with another sight, and the rainbow is for him no mere beautiful arrangement of colors, but 'God's seven spirits,' bringing a message of peace and love to his soul."

Another witness to the Celt's love of nature, a prince among the authorities, is Archbship Healy, the scholarly historian of Ireland's ancient scholars. In the preface to his classic book[2] we read: "They (the old saints and scholars) loved learning much, it is true, but they loved God and nature more. They knew nothing of what is now called civilization and were altogether ignorant of urban life; but still they had a very keen perception of the grandeur and beauty of God's universe. The voice of the storm and the strength of the sea, the majesty of lofty mountains and the glory of summer woods spoke to their hearts even more eloquently than the voice of the preacher or the writing on their parchments."

---

[1] James O'Donovan, C. C., "Irish Eccl. Record," 1899.

[2] "Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars."

To us transmarines the reading of old Irish literature at first hand is not possible; we must be content to learn of its characteristics from proper authorities, and through the eyeglasses of translation we may see that the Christian bard was sure always to note the "God of the Elements." That is a phrase dating from the first half of the fifth century in the illustrious "Lorica," a poem which is attributed to St. Patrick and which, to quote Archbishop Healy again,[3] is "to this day chanted by the peasantry of the South and West in the ancestral tongue, and it is regarded as a strong shield against all evils natural and supernatural."

Again, from the hymn of St. Sanctain, written in the middle of the next century, we read in a translation of one of the verses:

> I will utter the praises of Mary's son,
> Who battles our white battles.[4]
> May God of the elements answer;
> A corslet in battle shall be my prayer.

And, finally, not to multiply passages containing this and similar phrases, we note these lines from a seventh century poem by St. Colman:

> May the Sovereign of lampful Heaven ward off from us our misery.
> . . . .
> Under the protection of the King of the elements, this guardianship may He not take from us.

In his splendid essay on Celtic literature, Matthew Arnold quotes a passage from Lucan and adds: "There is the testimony of an educated Roman fifty years after Christ." Lucan had given witness to the love of nature among the bards and druids, and to the ancient Celtic race that possessed a special, profound, spiritual discipline and was wiser than their neighbors. Christianity accentuated that discipline, and the druids, though "their dwelling was in the lone heart of the forest," could not prize the charms of nature with as true a love as, in later centuries, the saintly bards did who sang with such delight of "the holy hills of Ireland." Always was the scene, as the rainbow with God's seven spirits, lit up by some thought of the Creator. Columcille is but one name out of a legion who thought his garden the abode of white angels:

---

[3] *Ibid*, p. 77.

[4] It will not be amiss to add a note about the unusual expression "white battles." In an Irish sermon, published from a Cambray MS. of the eighth century, by Zeuss, we read: "There are three sorts of martyrdom, all of which give the crown of suffering to man: white martyrdom, blue martyrdom and red martyrdom. It is white martyrdom when man, through love of God, foregoes all the pleasures and enjoyments of life." *Vide* "Irish Eccl. Record," 1867.

Through Derry's oak groves angels white
  In countless thousands come and go;
And gleams, as if of God's delight,
Fall calm and clear to mortal sight
  Upon beloved Raphoe.[5]

And that note, which comes from the Celt's wonderful insight, is rich in Irish literature still. To instance examples of the modern expression of that power would be to collect an anthology of no small size. Canon Sheehan is one of the notable examples among the moderns. Not the fertility of his pen in fiction and poetry marks him for our purpose, for in that line of production Walter Scott is in the first rank. But Canon Sheehan is the Celt when, from his environment of hills and valleys, he makes a little preachment—not a somniferous drone nor a novice sermon, but an obvious, vital reflection from the inspiration in the scene before his eyes. The portico to which he goes for his meditation is not amid the arcades of a library, neither to an academic cloister; his lecture hall and ascetorium is "under the cedars and the stars." Is it the time of autumn? He looks at the little garden plot; the bulbs of the hyacinth and of the dahlia are being set there. "The former wakes up in early spring, and hangs its sweet bells on the pure virgin air, while the latter sleeps on through the cold of spring and the blazing heat of summer, and only wakes up when all nature is dying around them, and seems to be calling, calling for another proof of its immortality. Who is the watchman of the flowers? . . . Who hath marked their times and seasons and warns them when their hour hath struck? Who but Thou, great Warden of the universe?"

Again it is the Maytime, and the wondrous vision of a lily stands before him like a vested acolyte in a holy sanctuary. Quick is the thought to the Celt that here is type and method and plan and—mind. "Raffaelle could paint that Lily of Israel, that Rose of Sharon; but he could not create this tiny flower in my fingers. . . . If only mind could create a Sistine Madonna, how could chance create that which is greater, lovelier? . . . Chance could never put that mother's look in the soft brown eyes, nor that dreamy far-sight into the eyes of the Child. . . . And how, then, could unconscious chemistry—the mere fortuitous coincidence of atoms—create this floral beauty that springs from the dull, brown clods of my garden beds? Here is a little water and a little oil—that is all! Who combined them into such a lovely form? Has water these potencies of color in itself, and has oil in itself that sweet, subtle fragrance? And this outward curve, like a lip turned backwards in the coquetry of anger, who hath given it? . . . 'Chance! Unconscious chemistry!' It is against all the traditions of our experience, all the arguments of a reasoning mind."

---

[5] T. D. Sullivan's paraphrase.

One other instance—the latest to come from the Island of Saints and Scholars—must suffice for our illustration. It is a series of discourses[6] by an old, blind Jesuit, who still keeps rich, though his eyes have failed him, the memory of his lessons from nature. Two only of his "studies" shall we glance at. They will show the method of the Celt in reading an evangel from the things of the world. The first is "The Sermon of the Sea." The picture places are familiar to all of us, but how few of us have had Father Kane's mind before them? Take our stand with him by the shore. It is a bright summer morning, but like much of the brightness of life there is little of real color in it, and it is all in the distance. The vast moving expanse bids us for a moment to leave the world of matter and the time that is made of days and to listen to the text in varying harmony, "Thou must conquer or thou shalt die." Wait and learn the secret of the ocean's power—small drops united in law; and life is but infinite atoms of good, stirred and strengthened into one boundless and magnanimous motive. Many are the dead beneath the waters; but grow not timid, for the sea is true to the brave; it is a slave to the strong. Here by the high rocks and cliffs learn what patience may accomplish; for the sea has patiently awaited its hour to return, and now it is coming back, with the roar of cannon and the rattle of musketry, to conquer every cave of the fortress. See the ship in full sail moving along the horizon like a vision of purity, a revelation of love. There may be perils ahead, but perils make the hardy sailor. Be brave; watch the compass; the glad cry will surely come, "Land!" the everlasting shore. And now we see that Christ was there always, most powerful in the most appalling storm of life. The Lord hath reigned, "now the sea is saying: 'Thou hast conquered, thou shalt never die.'"

And, finally, there is the lesson from "The Plough." How simple is the text, so like the Master's lilies of the field and the birds of the air in Israel long ago. And what is the message of the plough? It is only the simplest emblem of work, the token of the tillage of the soil, but on its humble service all greatness leans, and "not only the honest doing of duty and the earnest earning of honor, but also the fulfillment of brave aims and the realization of exalted ideals depend always, and depend absolutely upon the commonplace tillage of character." The plough works slowly; but, after all, the race is not to the swift, and patience is a mighty power. It is hard work; "when we feel too weak to work and too worthless to pray, then it is very hard to plough; but such work is useful; it gives hardihood to the man, healthiness to the soil and harvest to the home." The soul must be cultivated; when the plough is hardest, more vigorous should be the effort. The monk turned moors into gardens. The golden harvest will come. Who sow in tears shall reap in joy. Look forward; the past is dead. "Forward like a true man! For 'no man putting his hand to the plough and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God.'"

---

[6] "The Sermon of the Sea and Other Studies," by Rev. Robert Kane, S. J.

Here, therefore, is a preëminence that may be conceded to the Celt—the possession and the exercise of a spiritual discipline that reads aright the great book of the universe. Such a gift marked the writings of the ancient Hebrews. Before the Old Testament was written, as one of the fathers noted long ago, God gave to mankind the wondrous volume of the starry skies and the varied visions by land and sea, and Israel read therein the lessons of wisdom: "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands. Day to day uttereth speech, and night to night showeth knowledge. There are no speeches nor language where their voices are not heard." But in a later word the Psalmist lamented that there are those who will not understand: "For Thou hast given me a delight in Thy doings, and in the works of Thy hands I will rejoice. The senseless man shall not know; nor will the fool understand these things." That reproach falls not on the true Celt; he has kept the vision that Israel abandoned long ago.

Now and then some foreigner or some half-Celt, like François Coppee, in a moment of spiritual exaltation catches the gleam. Coppee, for instance, once stood on a mountain height overlooking Geneva. Below him the city lay hidden under its chilling fog, and only the raucous din of wheels and whistles reached him to tell him that a city was there beneath him as in a tomb. Above him the sun shone in the cloudless sky. Coppee stood and looked, but all he saw was *the fact*. It was years afterwards that the scene had a deeper vision for him; years afterwards, when, during the last days of his life, enjoying the surpassing peace of soul of which he writes in "La Bonne Souffrance," he was standing on other heights, up the mountain of life, and his past years lay hidden under the fog of waywardness; but he could catch some glimpses of the light out of the immeasurable eternity above him; and that would have been his lesson had he been a true Celt on the morning near Geneva.

Happy is the observer to whom comes, even late in life, the great meaning that underlies the fact. But many are they who have eyes and see not. Matthew Arnold is typical of a class who take only a colorless stoicism from the voices of nature:

> When thou dost bask in Nature's eye,
> Ask how she viewed thy self-control. . . .
> Nature, whose free, light, cheerful air
> Oft made thee in thy gloom despair.

And Shelley is kin to another tribe who can see only ephemeral beauty in the magic scenes, beauty that passes into nothingness and leaves the spirit pessimistic, "Our sincerest laughter with some pain is fraught." But the Celt has the feeling and the logic of wisdom; his perceptions bring right valuations; to him always "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof."

MICHAEL EARLS, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

IS THERE ANY SUCH THING AS ESSENTIAL RIGHT AND WRONG?

THE question here put will have to be answered in the affirmative; but if the reply is to be fully understood, the confusion that has entered into books will have to be patiently cleared away by a process that ought not to be uninteresting to a mind which loves serious thought on a subject of vital importance to man.

I.

To start with an illustration of the confused treatment of which we speak, we will take Pufendorf, who, with Hugo Grotius, is such a constant object of attack in our Catholic text-books of ethics. Yet there is so much religion common to the two that in these days of wider departure from truth they might rather be greeted as relatively strong friends to our cause. Now Pufendorf almost at the outset of his work has a passage for which our Catholic writers, in constant succession one after another, have assailed his name. By itself it certainly sounds ill: "Man obtained a social nature from the good pleasure of God, not from any immutable necessity, and consequently the morality of actions proper or improper to him as a social creature must be derived from the same source, and must be attributed to men, not by an absolute, but by an hypothetical necessity."[1] The absurdity here in the end really lies in arguing what man might have been if he had not been man, but had been of some other nature, for instance, a brute animal, in which, as Pufendorf truly but futilely remarks, those actions imply no turpitude which in man would be morally disgraceful. Again, the same author in contending that evil deeds could not be sinful if no divine author prohibited them,[2] is talking ineffectually, because the divine Legislator necessarily forbids, even though He should make no positive revelation of His will thereon, whatever is intrinsically wrong. Pufendorf himself is really aware of this, and therefore accuses Grotius of an impious hypothesis when he treats merely as a supposition, not as a fact, the contrary notion that there is antecedently an intrinsic wrongness independent of the prohibition by God of what violates rational propriety. Grotius is careful to qualify this as an extreme and impious hypothesis—*quod sine sermone scelere dari nequit, non esse Deus aut non curari ab eo negotia humana.*[3] What he wishes is no more than what St. Ignatius does in his meditation on sin when he bids us consider the inordinateness of the act prior to the divine prohibition.

---

[1] "The De Jure Naturae et Gentium," Lib. I., cap. 2, n. 6 and 7.

[2] "Non apparet quomodo honestas aut turpitudo intelligi posset ante legem et citra superioris impositionem." Lib. I., c. 2, n. 6.

Pufendorf is really more confusing than is Grotius when he frames his hypothesis that man might guiltlessly do what brutes do if he were an irrational creature, but not while he is what he is. "Though God is not obliged by necessity to create man, yet when once He decreed to create him as a rational and social being, it was impossible but that the present natural law should be that proper to the human condition not by an absolute, but by a hypothetic necessity," that is, on the hypothesis that man is a "rational and social being."[4]

As any other sort of being would not be a man, the whole hypothesis comes to nothing, and Pufendorf is wrong, not exactly in the way imagined by most of our scholastic text-books, which say that he founds morality on the free will of God, but because, on another than the frequently reported interpretation, he introduces much perplexity by arguing out at length an hypothesis which in the end turns out to be self-contradictory; human morality would not hold if man were not a man, and as God freely creates man, it also depends on the divine freedom for its actual existence.

II.

And now it is due from us to Pufendorf to show that he is not alone in the misfortune of involving himself in awkward definitions of the natural law. The Roman legalists started a troublesome course and the scholastic did not boldly break away from it as misleading or at least unprofitable. Ulpian[5] defined the natural law, as it is distinct from the law of nations, to be what is not peculiar to man, but common to all animals of earth, sea and sky: *Jus*

---

[3] "De Jure Belli et Pacis Prolegom," n. 11. See Pufendorf's indignant comment about the wretch who would maintain this wicked and senseless hypothesis. Lib. II., cap. 3, n. 19.

[4] Lib. II., c. 2, n. 6-10—a good refutation of the errors committed by Hobbes in his theory of society and human morality.

[5] Digest I., 1-4.

naturale est quod natura omnia animalia docuit: non est humani generis proprium. The instances that can be given with plausibility really concern incidents which affect only a small portion of the merely animal kingdom—namely, those species which bring up their offspring with an assignable degree of systematic care, comparable to family organization, a feature reducible to that more generic principle from which St. Thomas argues in condemnation of suicide—namely, the natural tendency of living things to persevere in life and to develop it to its best outcome. Spinoza also lays stress on the principle: *Quo magis unusquisque suum utile quaerit et se conservare conatur, eo magis virtute praditus est.*[6] The inconvenience of the scheme is that it attributes rights to beings that have no strictly moral claims because they are irrational, while it offers very few particulars in which men and beasts can be said to hold in common their "rights." Long before the humanist Laurentius Valla had found fault with the above distinction of rights which has no place in Aristotle, and some years before Ulpian's division, Gaius as representing Roman law had proposed another and better division into the natural law common to all peoples because of its essentiality to a morally conducted life and the civil law peculiar to the several peoples of different countries: *Quod quisque populus ipse sibi jus constituit, id ipsius proprium est vocaturque civile; quod vero naturalis ratio inter omnes homines constituit, vocatur jus gentius.*[7] Other lawyers of the Roman Empire, omitting all reference to the mere animal order, found it convenient to differentiate among men the natural law from the Jus Gentium, which was less wide. St. Thomas came across these terminologies as established modes of speech in his time, and he simply took them for what they were worth, without saying that they were irreproachable. Hence if any one likes to quote St. Thomas as a defender of animal rights on the ground that he repeats Ulpian's phraseology,[8] that course is open, but it leads to no issue; for St. Thomas adds that as applied to the brute creation *Jus naturale* has not got its strictest sense. By the *Jus Gentium* St. Thomas means the necessary conclusions from the principles of natural right.[9] But this distinction does not admit of great precision as to the exact necessity in detail; we may connect the case of necessity with that of immediacy. In philosophy we often talk of what is immediately evident and what mediately; of what is primitive in knowledge and what is derivative; what is intuitive and what inferential; what is ultimately simple and what is resolvable into prior elements. There is a truth in such distinctions, and often they are serviceable. At the same time it would be possible, under qualifications carefully introduced and retained, to hold the opinions both that all our knowledge is immediate and that all is mediate. For whatever we know must in the end come to us as a sort of intuition. On the other hand, in reflective examination there is no intuition that we can specify which can be shown to stand quite alone without support from anything else; we know nothing in a regular philosophical way till we know many things together in a system. Hence when we discuss what are the less obvious inferences from the principles of natural law and what are the directly given implications without any strictly inferential process, or even what are the first principles themselves which are in no way derivatives, we are apt to fall into uncertainties. Suarez is alive to this difficulty when he remarks: "Not all that is attributed to the Jus Gentium answers the test of being intrinsically and essentially matter of the natural law."[10]

---

[6] "Ethica," Part IV., Prop. 35; Coroll., 2 *cf.*, Prop. 20.

[7] Instit. I., 1.

[8] 2da, 2dae, Q. 57, A. 3.

[9] 1a, 2dae, Q. 95, A. 4.

A further perusal of the chapter just cited from Suarez will show how some theorists try to make use of distinctions which cannot practically be carried into details; and the weakness here discovered is one which it is most important to bear in mind when, for instance, we come across such a statement as that of Hume that justica among men is not purely the dictate of nature, but requires a convention, or the assertions that private property is or is not natural; that civil authority is or is not natural; that monogamy is or is not natural. Of private property Cicero had said: *"Sunt privata nulla natura,"*[11] and St. Ambrose repeated the idea, *"Natura jus commune generavit usurpatio (appropriatio) jus fecit privatum."*[12] The words of Suarez for which in the present connection we wish to claim attention are these: "Some say that *Jus naturale* contains only those conclusions which are so necessary that they follow evidently from the principles of nature, apart from the consideration of human society or apart from the action of human will and from the circumstances introduced as needful for human preservation." Here we are reminded of Pufendorf and of his attempt at an abstraction so great that it baffles our efforts to make a successful application. Yet the very failures may prove useful in suggesting a clue to the question how certain disputes arise as to what is of natural law, what belongs to its first principles and what to its deductions. To avoid such conflict Suarez finds it convenient to alter St. Thomas' division and to make the *Jus Gentium* something outside the *jus naturale:*

---

[10] De Leg., Lib. 11., cap. 17.

[11] De Offic. I., 7.

[12] Migne, tom. 16, col. 627.

"The *Jus Gentium* prescribes nothing of its own nature essential to righteousness, and it forbids nothing of its own nature essentially wrong, either absolutely or relatively to some condition of affairs. All these matters belong to the natural law."

Pufendorf, in view of all these obscurities in scholastic terminology, may claim to be treated leniently if, in his endeavor after a high degree of abstraction he landed himself in somewhat of a terminological bog. His predecessor, Grotius, had managed the same matter with admirable clearness: "Natural law is the dictate of right reason; an act is morally good or morally bad in itself according as it does or does not befit the rational nature. Some of the former acts are commanded, and all the latter acts are forbidden by God, the Author of nature," who, where the discrimination of the two classes rests on essential distinction, is not free to change His attitude; what is strictly natural law "is so immutable that God Himself cannot alter it," all seeming exceptions being really reconcilable with the rule.[13] Grotius repudiates the extension made by some Roman lawyers of *Jus naturale* to irrational animals.

The guiding lines through all the above discussion are really to be found in that vital chapter of the scholastic philosophy which treats of possibilities in created or creatable objects. Descartes was quite astray from the truths there laid down when he said: "God did not wish the three angles of a triangle to be equal to two right angles because He thought that they could not be otherwise; but, on the contrary, because he wished them to be so they cannot be otherwise."[14] The only truth at which such a declaration could aim would be to exclude from God any necessity outside His own nature to which He was compelled in His will to conform. Such independence is secured by the fact that the necessities of the triangle rest for their foundation in God's own being. It was a difficulty on this point which was before the mind of Pufendorf when he said in defense of attributing moral law to the Divine will: "Those who would establish an eternal rule of morality for actions, without respect to the divine precept, seem to be joining with God Almighty some principle coeval and extrinsic, which He was obliged to follow in assigning the forms or essences of things." Such a fear is creditable to its entertainer, but is grounded on a misconception of the scholastic treatise *De Possibilibus.*

III.

The Scotist School has been troublesome. Ockham is clearly wrong. He held that God of His absolute power could go so far as to alter what seems the most immutable of duties—namely, that of reverencing Himself. If, says Ockham, God commanded a creature to blaspheme the divinity, that order would make blasphemy a virtue.[15] But ordinary Scotists are much more reasonable. They distinguish the Ten Commandments into two tables; of these the first refers to God, and apart from the accidental determination of divine worship on a particular day of the week, the Sabbath or the Sunday, it is unchangeable, because the creature's attitude of respect to the Creator cannot change. But the second table is not so unalterable. If we were creatures without bodies, then the 4th, the 5th, the 6th, the 7th and perhaps the 8th commandment would lose all or most of their contents. Again, God as Supreme Possessor as well of all persons as of all things, could command Abraham to sacrifice Isaac or the Israelites to spoil the Egyptians. Apart from the sacrament which consecrates matrimony, God might give some dispensations as regards the natural contract of that union.

---

[13] Lib. I., cap. I., sect. x. et sect. xi.

[14] Resp. ad Objectiones Sextas.

IV.

After so many preliminaries we may now briefly answer our original question by affirming that there is an essential difference in all matters except those of purely positive precept, between right and wrong, but the assertion of it needs much circumspection and can be given only by one who has studied the accounts of the natural law which the preceding pages have sketched. Man has a rational nature, the demands of which he can reflexly consider and see what is due from it in relation to himself, to his fellows and to God. Some things there are so slightly befitting or misfitting that they can hardly be said to come directly under the moral law of virtue or sin, but others are of greater import and belong to the moral category. The best method of illustration is to take the ten commandments and to search out the reasons for each in the nature of natural humanity, considering man both as an individual and as a member of society, in each of which capacities there is a further reference of him to God. Many proximate finite ends must be accomplished as obligatory, and all these must be ordained to one final end. The relations of moral obligation, though not determinable with the same precision as mathematical relations, yet have the same necessity in the ultimate laws of right and wrong as affecting an intelligent being, created by God for His own glory and for the good of the creatures themselves, first in their preparatory stage and then in a last consummation.

V.

It is needless to point out how much the doctrine here propounded disagrees with the non-theistic or agnostic view, which on evolutionary principles allows man no stable nature for which the immutable can be prescribed. The non-theistic ethics declare only that mankind must keep up a moving equilibrium; each generation must adapt itself to the best standard of conduct available for its own age. One age is thus not more moral than another, but simply moral in another way, so far as each equates itself to its own standard. For an equation is an equation all the world over. At the same time the quantities equated may be higher, and from this point of view moral progress is conceded. Two and two equal four, as ten and ten equal twenty. In each case there is equality, but twenty is a higher number than four. So our morality has a wider and a richer standard than that of our ruder ancestors. What man may become some agnostics declare themselves utterly unable to determine; it may be something to us so strange that our morality will have no application to it, or will on some points have to be reversed.

---

[15] In 2 Sent, Q. 19 ad 3 et 4.

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

THE DIARY OF VADSTENA.

ONE of the most interesting orders in the Catholic Church is that of the Brigittines, so called after their foundress, St. Bridget, or Borgit, of Sweden. Its real title is the Order of St. Saviour, because, as the pious foundress believed, Our Lord Himself revealed the rule to her. Founded by a Princess, it was eminently an aristocratic order, to which many noble and high-born women and learned and eminent men belonged, while Vadstena, the cradle and mother house, was for close on two centuries the centre of Catholic life in Sweden. Kings and Queens visited it, and sometimes made it a place of refuge. Some of its best treasures were their gifts, and partly through their influence its prestige in Sweden in the fifteenth century was very great.

The monastery, like all Brigittine monasteries till the seventeenth century, was a double one for monks and nuns, and it is with the diary kept by the monks of this great religious house that we propose to deal here. Fortunately it has survived, though somewhat mutilated, where many other records of this most fascinating order have perished. It was, of course, written in Latin, and dates from the year of the foundation of Vadstena, in 1346, to its suppression, in 1545. The original is in the Library of Upsala, but there is a copy of it published in Fant's "Rerum Suecicarum." Extending as it does over nearly two centuries, the entries, needless to say, are made by different hands, and there is nothing to show where one chronicler left off and another took up the pen. Indeed, the personal element is very much kept in the background, and only occasionally does the writer make any comment on what he narrates, though when this is done the remarks are generally very much to the point and lend a greater interest to what is in the main a chronicle of the deaths and funerals which took place in the monastery and of the reception of the various monks and nuns into the order. We ought to say that the two convents were quite distinct and were divided by the church, and monks and nuns could only hold communication with each other through a grille.

We shall first summarize the diary and then quote the more interesting entries, some of which are of historical importance, as will be seen.

The first few years are very briefly dealt with. It is not till 1384[1] that the diary is regularly kept. The first entry records the death of Uulf, Prince of Mercia, St. Bridget's husband, and adds that in that year the revelations were first made to the saint. In 1346 St. Bridget went to Rome, "according to Our Lord's command." From 1350 there comes a gap which lasts till 1365, when another chronicler has taken the pen and flies rather high in his description of the state of the country after the deposition of the King of Sweden and his imprisonment at Stockholm and the election of Albert, son of Henry, Duke of Magnipolens, as his successor. "Then," he says, "rapacious birds occupied the tops of the mountains, for the Teutons tyrannized in the land for many years."

In 1367 St. Bridget had an audience of the Pope in Rome, and in 1370 received the confirmation of the constitutions of her rule from Urban VI., which she herself presented to him, and the following year she made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and in 1373 died at Rome. A note in the margin says the chronicler made a wrong calculation in the date of the death of St. Bridget, which really took place on the 23d of July in that year. And here we may remark that all through the diary it is necessary to have a calendar of the saints of the Church before one, for everything is dated either on the eve of a feast or on the feast itself, or some ferial day in the middle of the octave of some festival.

In 1374 St. Bridget's remains were removed from Rome to Vadstena and buried in the monastery. The next year her daughter Catherine left Vadstena, of which she was now abbess, and went to Rome to negotiate the canonization of her mother. In 1378 the death of the first confessor general of the order took place. This was Father Peter Alvaster, who was St. Bridget's confessor and director. He set the music of the chant to be used by the nuns and, says the diary, "many good things were to be found about him elsewhere."

---

[1] Fant's Scriptores, "Rerum Suecicarum," Vol. I., Diarium Wazsteusee.

In 1389 St. Catherine placed the cause of her mother's canonization in the Papal Consistory and brought forward fifty-one articles in support of it, and in December of the same year she received the final confirmation of the rule and constitutions from Urban VI. In 1381 Catherine died and was buried in the church at Vadstena.

From 1384 the diary is regularly kept, and though always provokingly brief, it is fuller than in the first few years. Therefore, we shall endeavor to pick out the plums for the reader's benefit. The events chronicled easily resolve themselves into classes; first, there are those which concern the monastery itself, and next those which come under the denomination of history and concern the world outside the enclosure walls. And there is often a quite unconscious humorous discrepancy in the juxtaposition of some great national calamity or revolution and the chronicle of some monastic event of little consequence to the world at large.

Of monastic events, besides the necrology of the order and the account of the reception of monks and nuns, all the journeys of any monks to Rome or to other places for the sake of making new foundations are duly chronicled, and often the news of their safe arrival at their destination or of their misfortunes on their way in days when travel was fraught with so many dangers. From this we learn of the foundations of many of the monasteries of the order in various other countries, as, for instance, that of the English Brigittine monastery at Syon Abbey, near Isleworth, founded and endowed by Henry V. in 1415. We read in the diary on the 13th of May that at "the pressing wish of the Queen," Philippa, wife of Eric XIII. and daughter of our Henry IV., "there were sent to England for the foundation of Syon Abbey two fathers, one Brother and four Sisters and three novices. They were led out with great solemnity by the Archbishop of Lund, a Norwegian Bishop and a great number of knights, who accompanied them for a short distance."

The Italian Brigittine monastery of Porta Paradiso, just outside the city of Florence, was founded from Vadstena, and the diary tells us that on the 1st of May, 1394, Father Magnus Peter, accompanied by several other monks, set out for Rome, first for the purpose of opening this house. Sometimes the Vadstena Fathers or the confessor general and one or two monks went to some of the other monasteries of the order to settle quarrels or difficulties which had arisen. This happened in the case of the monastery of Maria-Kron, in Stralsund, a foundation from Maria-Wald, in Lubeck, Poland, which soon after its foundation quarreled with its mother house about its independence, whereupon Vadstena was appealed to, and the diary contains a letter from Father Ulph, the prior, to another father at Reval telling him that he hears to his grief that the enemy has been sowing tares, and bidding him to go to both convents and make peace and administer correction, and thereby gives him the necessary faculties for so doing.

In 1446 this monastery of Maria-Kron got into great trouble with the Bishop of the diocese, who wished to be the visitor of the convent against the will of the monks, who refused to allow him to do so, whereupon the Bishop excommunicated them, and they in their sore distress appealed to Vadstena, who, as the diary tells us, sent two fathers with letters from the King of Denmark, and several influential noblemen to the angry Bishop, who was so far appeased that he removed the ban of excommunication, but said that he valued the injuries he had received and the contumelious conduct of the community at 3,000 ducats. The fathers then appealed to Rome, and the death of the Bishop in the following year, 1515, put an end to the dispute.

One of the fathers sent to settle this quarrel was Father Nicholas Amundi, who on his return continued the diary, as we learn from a footnote. The year after he was elected confessor general, and thus speaks of himself in chronicling the fact: "A most unworthy man as I protest with my own hand, in labors from my youth, but in my exaltation I am humiliated and troubled."

The monastery of Maria-Brun, in Dantzic, was another that from its foundation gave trouble to the mother house, as appeared at the general chapter held at Vadstena in 1429, when it was stated that the mother house had had scarcely any knowledge of its foundation, and a resolution was passed that for the future no dishonorable persons should be received into the order, as to their shame had been at Dantzic, and the general master in Prussia was to be written to and told to remove this blot from the convent and send certain of the Dantzic nuns to another convent, where they were to live under the name of "penitents," which, if certain things mentioned by Benzelius in a footnote were true, was certainly the best name for them, always supposing that they had repented of their disgraceful conduct. Again, in 1506, we read in the diary that on the 28th of April the confessor general and another father set out to visit this Dantzic convent, because "the old complaints of that monastery were renewed," and certainly this time the scandal was very great, and one of the monks, whose conscience was stricken at the disorders, escaped from the convent and went to the Bishop to complain and wrote to Vadstena. War, however, had broken out, and the Vadstena fathers were unable to reach Dantzic, but were forced to go to the monastery of Maria-Thal, near Reval, which they had also intended to visit to settle a dispute there, and there they were obliged to remain for a long time, and then, having been absent too long from Vadstena, were forced to return there without getting to Dantzic. Ten years later, when the Reformation broke out, this Dantzic monastery and the church were burnt down, and after that pestilence broke out, whereby many lost their lives. It is good to learn that under all these trials, though some of the nuns apostatized, many remained true to their faith and to their vocation. The monastery was rebuilt later, and when the heroic nuns of Vadstena were turned out of their beloved and famous monastery by the Protestants in 1595, they chose the convent of Maria-Brun for their place of refuge.

If disorders occurred in the Dantzic monastery, Vadstena, on the contrary, was noted for the holiness of its members. Founded as it was by a canonized saint of the Church, its first abbess only missing canonization because the Reformation prevented her cause from being carried to the final stages, it produced many most saintly men and women. Three of the earlier confessors general—the first, Peter of Alvaster; the second, Magnus Person, and the fifth, Ulpho Birgeri—were beatified. Besides these, several of the fathers and nuns died in the odor of sanctity, and the diary, though always very brief in its notes, frequently mentions the holy lives led by persons whose deaths it chronicles. Of Catherine herself it says not a word, but of one of her successors, Ingeborg, who died in 1400, we read that "she first lived a most holy life in the world with her husband, excelling all the inhabitants of Skening by her good works. Two years after his death she became a nun at Vadstena, where for seven years she lived most perfectly, macerating her body with fasts and vigils and giving every day the best portions of her own food to the poor. She was warned three times in a vision, after her entrance to the monastery, that her life there would not be a long one, and from that time she increased in fervor and humility, spending most of her time in prayer, and at the end of seven years after her entrance into religion died a most edifying death."

Another holy nun, one of the first ones entering Vadstena, was Sister Ramborgh, who lived to the great age of 110 and preserved all her faculties unimpaired up to her death, in 1401, and lived all these years most devoutly. In the following year is mentioned the death of Sister Margaret Lassa, who, "although she was one of the highest nobles in the land, was so humble that she was prompt to choose all the most servile work in the monastery kitchen, and washed for the fathers as well as for the nuns. At the same time she was most useful in the choir and a *persona grata* to all."

Again, in 1411, the death of a saintly nun is chronicled—Sister Elenia Sonao, who lived in the greatest penance, subduing her flesh with rigorous fasts and disciplines. For the last five years of her life she was almost always ill, but bore her illness with the greatest patience, and at last, when her body was nothing but skin and bone, died peacefully. In 1412 died the first consecrated abbess, Ingegard, a relation of St. Bridget. She held the abbatial office for eighteen years, and resigned it nine years before her death. She served God with all her heart in great humility. Her last moments are described at some length: "For some time before her death she was always ill, though not always in bed. Then she suffered from the most violent headache, and having confessed all her sins very devoutly, fell on the bed, and having received the last sacraments most piously, took the crucifix in her arms and, saying, 'Oh, sweetest Mary, Mother of God, help me,' breathed out her soul."

Nor were the monks behind the nuns in sanctity. Of Blessed Peter Alvaster, the friend and confessor of St. Bridget, we have already spoken. His successor, Father Magnus Person, died in Florence, in the monastery of Porta Paradiso. He was distinguished for his spiritual as well as for his worldly knowledge, and was chosen as prior when Father Peter Alvaster went to Rome about the canonization of St. Bridget. He died in the odor of sanctity and was beatified.

Father Ulpho, the fifth confessor general, is dismissed in a few words in the diary, though also one of the blessed of the order. All it says of him is "that he was one of the most illustrious men not only of Vadstena, but of the whole order, and among other graces he had the gift of interpreting some of the most difficult passages in the revelations of St. Bridget."

Another very holy man was Father Olaf, who died during the elevation at High Mass on April 26, 1399. The diary says: "He had been a faithful laborer for the canonization of the foundress, and as he was on his way to Rome for this object he was taken prisoner by the Saracens and was in captivity for over two years. He suffered from hunger and thirst and was cruelly beaten frequently. He was sold three times, and was redeemed finally by a Spanish Bishop and returned to Vadstena. He then went to Rome for the actual ceremony of the canonization of St. Bridget, and after his return lived a holy life in the monastery." He suffered from great temptations from the devil, described in the diary, before his death, which in the end was peaceful and happy.

Father Andreas Lydhekini, who died on August 25, 1410, in the twenty-third year of his profession, is mentioned "as a most attentive observer of regular discipline and most quiet in his conversation. He was very industrious and wrote many sermons and other things for the convent. He also collected and wrote some of the entries in this diary and lived chastely and holily all his life. For three years he suffered from fevers, from which he finally died." Here we may remark that the illnesses mentioned in the diary do not lead us to thing much of the skill of the doctors of those days nor of their power of diagnosing diseases. We should like to know what the fevers were of which the long suffering Father Andreas died, and what was the nature of the headache which killed Sister Ingegard. In one place a nun is said to have died of a disease "which is called 'thisis,'" as though this was a recent discovery, as perhaps it was, and they had not then learnt to spell it properly. Several times sudden deaths occurred, but the chronicler never seems to know what was the cause of them. An instance of this is the death of Father Tydhekinus, on October 17, 1413. "He rose to Matins when the other fathers did, feeling as well as usual, but as he was leaving his cell he was suddenly seized with pain, and only with the help of another monk could he enter the room of the confessor general, where he confessed as well as he could, although he had already made his confession that night, as it was his custom to do every night before going to bed. He was then carried to the infirmary and received Extreme Unction, but before the prayers were finished he expired. He wrote a great many collects and hymns and lived most praiseworthily in the order for twenty-seven years. He was an ascetic, and after his death a very large, coarse and prickly hair shirt was found under his clothes, which he had worn constantly next to his skin."

Father Nicolas Amundi was another very holy man. He was thrice confessor general, and we learn from Benzelius that he had kept the diary for the last ten years before his election. He resigned the office of prior, as the confessor general was also styled, after three years, but was reëlected in 1524. He again resigned in 1525 and was elected for the third time in 1528, when the storm of the Reformation broke over the monastery and the beginning of the end of this famous convent brought much suffering to the inmates. He died in 1543.

Accidents, especially from fire, were of frequent occurrence and form a large item of the entries. So many of the buildings of those days being of wood, the risk of fire was, of course, very great, so it is not surprising that we hear of great conflagrations in which whole towns were destroyed. Sometimes the monastery suffered in the same way. Thus, in 1388, a fire broke out in the middle of the night in the wooden chapel of the monastery and destroyed it completely as well as two stone houses and a great part of the nuns' convent, in which fire one of the lay Brothers was burnt to ashes. The chronicler goes on to say that this Brother had a great love for Our Lady, and when the chapel was burning he threw himself into the midst of the flames to rescue her image, and in returning was enveloped in them, "whose soul it is piously believed Our Blessed Lady, for whose love he died, led to heaven."

In 1416 the whole of the roof of the church of Linkoping was destroyed by lightning. In 1419 the whole of the city of Stockholm and the castle were burnt to the ground, but the churches were saved and a very few of the houses. The chronicler adds "that the hand of the Lord was laid more severely on that town than in 1407," when, as is also noted in the diary of that year, the town was suddenly attacked by fire in broad daylight, and over one thousand lives lost, besides the monastery of the friars preachers, which was destroyed and some of the friars themselves cremated. In 1422 the greater part of the town of Vadstena, including the parish church and the Bishop's court, were burnt to the ground. In 1447 the town and cathedral of Upsala were burnt; in 1485 the monastery of Vadstena caught fire about 10 o'clock at night, but no one in the convent perceived it till they were awakened by the people of the town, who with a great clamor and tumult broke open the door of the fathers' enclosure, and "in one hour, by the help of God and with great labor, it was extinguished." Ten years later a more serious fire broke out in the new infirmary of the monastery and burnt to ashes everything that was kept there, including several volumes of the revelations of St. Bridget.

Pestilence was another of the ills to which the human flesh of those days was subject, and mention is frequently made of it, as, for example, one of the very first entries in the diary is in 1350, "when a great mortality prevailed in Sweden, than which no one remembered a greater either before or after," and this was foretold by St. Bridget in her revelations, when Our Lord said to her: "I go through the world with My plough." The word pestilence is not mentioned in this case, but there is little doubt that the visitation was of that nature. In 1413 a great pestilence is chronicled in East Gothland and elsewhere, and in the town of Vadstena four hundred deaths occurred in six months from it, which seems to be considered by the writer a great number, and no doubt it was a large percentage of the population. In 1421 there was a great flood in the district, so that in many places the corn rotted as it stood,[2] and this was followed by pestilence and famine, which lasted for a whole year and never ceased, and in many parts of the country the desolation was so great that the houses were left without any inhabitants. The next year we read that the pestilence had increased in Germany and here in Sweden, and had now lasted two years.

---

[2] "Computruerunt segetes stantes in stipula," Diarium anno 1421.

But to return to monastic events, with which we are first concerned. Besides fires, accidents sometimes happened to those engaged in building the monastery. In 1393, the day after a great function had taken place in the convent church, on the occasion of the solemn bringing to Vadstena of the relics of St. Bridget, for which the church was splendidly decorated, as one of the lay Brothers was removing some of the drapery from the roof of the church, which he had himself placed there, he fell to the ground and died the same night. He is described as a very devout man and very necessary to the community, as he was both a good tailor and carpenter. We shall quote the following incident to show how important things, which to us of the twentieth century seem scarcely worth mentioning, were to the chronicler. He says that at High Mass on September 12, 1405, the father singing it was suddenly seized with faintness and had to leave the altar at the Credo, but another priest who had not said Mass that day was able to take his place. The cause of the faintness was supposed to be that he had had an attack of hemorrhage the day before, which we should say was quite sufficient to account for it, but it was, of course, not the illness of the priest so much as the interruption to Mass which constituted the "grave danger" of which the writer speaks.

Vadstena, like all Brigittine monasteries, was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese, and he had, therefore, the right to visit it at stated intervals. These visitations are always recorded in the diary, and from some of the remarks that are made about them they were evidently a trial to the inmates.

The first visitation of Vadstena was made in 1388 by the Bishop of Linkoping, in whose diocese the monastery was, and the following day he consecrated the first abbess, Ingegard. No remarks are made on this occasion, so all was apparently satisfactory. In 1402 another visitation is chronicled. This time the Bishop was accompanied by two canons, and after making his visitation on the first day to the Sisters and the second day to the fathers, on the third day he went round the whole monastery, dedicating and blessing and consecrating it. In 1405 another satisfactory visitation was made, and this time on the third day the Bishop went into the nuns' convent to see their cells, which were in course of construction, and found nothing contrary to the rule or the statutes. The next visitation mentioned did not take place till 1415, when the Bishop and two of the chapter of his cathedral got through the business in three hours the first day in the nuns' convent, and would have been still more expeditious the next day when they went to the monks, only a delay occurred concerning one of them. The writer adds that the venerable Bishop was most kind, and after he had finished what was evidently a delicate mission, he humbly recommended himself to the prayers of the fathers and begged them to pardon him if in anything he had offended them. In 1422 the visitation was less satisfactory. It took longer, and the Bishop proposed to reform many things, but eventually went away leaving all things unfulfilled.

In 1428 the visitation resulted in the Bishop interpreting the text of the rule which permits the abbess to touch and count the money, "since all things necessary for the community are to be expected at her hands," as the rule expressly decrees. He also directed the fathers that no one should in future be present at the general chapter from the monastery of Maria-Wald, nor should any articles in the covenant between them be conveyed there from this recent foundation in Lubeck.

The visitation in 1431 is dismissed in a few pithy words: "Diocesan visitation, but what was done afterwards God knows."

In 1438 there was no need to complain of inaction on the part of the Bishop, for as the result of his visitation he took away the faculties of the confessors of three of the nuns, but the diary says, "having received many writings for the reformation of both monks and nuns, he went away without determining on anything." In 1442 a different Bishop held the visitation and gave the chronicler reason to complain of his behavior. Having heard all the faults and transgressions of both monks and nuns explicitly enough, he did nothing definite, but proposed to deal with the transgressions of the priests and deacons at some future time and postponed the next visitation. "He declared nothing about the other affairs of the order, and what he did declare he revoked and allowed all things to remain, to the danger of souls, without ruling any reforms."

The fact that Vadstena was a double monastery led very early in its life to difficulties with Rome which occurred in its history, owing, it would seem, more to misrepresentation than to any real cause for objecting to the arrangement, which the foundress firmly believed Our Lord Himself had ordered her to make. Pope Urban V. had consented to this in a bull dated August 5, 1370, and, as we have seen, there was no communication between the two convents except by means of a grille. Even in the church, which monks and nuns used in common, they could not see each other, as the choir of the nuns was over that of the monks, while high walls divided the two convents. A later Pope, Urban VI., confirmed the statute setting forth the pattern on which the monastery was to be built on December 3, 1378.

In 1422 we read that on June 17 the Vadstena monks received from the Roman Court a copy of a certain order of the Pope, in which he commanded the monks of the order to separate themselves entirely from the adjacent convent of the nuns, where they had lived up to that time according to the rule of the order. The diary continues: "But we have begged the King and Queen, through the Lord Archbishop of Upsala, that they would entreat the Pope to revoke this threatening sentence. They sent the Dean of Strengsis, but in all this long business the Queen showed herself more zealous and more generous in gifts and offerings than the King. May Our Saviour, who is Himself the institutor of our rule, grant that in His strength it may be preserved intact."

In 1428, July 6, the fathers received the strictest citation from Rome, such as had never been heard before the beginning of the order, about the duality of the convents and of all things concerning the order. The following year there was held the general chapter at Vadstena, at which only those constitutions of the order which had received the confirmation of Pope Urban VI. were recognized, and it was decided that no more monasteries should be erected as double convents with separate enclosure and one church, but the order itself should be preserved in the unity of the rule, and it was further resolved to send the confessor general and another father to Rome to see what could be done. In the summer of 1431 we read that on June 26 they received letters at Vadstena from the father prior containing but doubtful consolation. Three months later his companion returned, bringing another letter from him, from which they gathered that he would be back himself soon. This controversy about the double convents threatened to destroy the order, but the danger was happily averted after a long struggle and through the intervention of princes and prelates and King Eric, who took a very active part, and finally the Pope, Martin V., finding he had been misinformed, revoked by a brief the bull which he had previously published against the duality of the monasteries.

Before the order had reached its prime a very heavy trial befell the mother house of Vadstena which is only briefly dealt with in the diary. It says that on October 23 a sentence of excommunication over both convents, which Father Eric, the procurator of St. Bridget's house at Rome, had procured unjustly, was brought to the monastery by the Archdeacon of Linkoping. The diary continues that steps were at once taken to remove this ban, and for this purpose Father Magnus Unonis and Father Olaf Gunari were sent to the Bishop of Linkoping. There had been for some months previous to this dissensions in the monastery as to the election of the abbess and the confessor general, both of whom had been deposed partly from political reasons too long to enter into here, and this had all been exaggerated and misrepresented at Rome, and so led to this severe sentence of excommunication, which was, however, soon removed.

The following year King Charles came to Vadstena, and in the father's refectory mentioned that he wished to dedicate his little daughter, then only a child of eight, as a nun in the monastery, and for that reason he had obtained a bull from Nicholas V., which, says the diary, "did not explain, as it ought to have done, that it was contrary to the rule on account of her age," but nevertheless the child was received for the year of probation, but in 1455, on February 24, her consecration and that of several others took place and is thus described in the diary: "In this consecration a transgression was made of the enclosure. There was a great pomp of ladies and young girls, of trumpets and other music which led and preceded the virgins to the gate which they ought to enter. There was no pride in the King's daughter; neither a smile nor tears were to be seen, but steadfastness of soul and devotion in taking the habit. But when she was commended to the abbess she wished to spring from her father's hands and go to the Sisters who were standing inside the monastery, showing her desire and love of entering the convent."

As in all convents, elections were one of the most important and exciting events and naturally form part of the entries. We shall only quote those here which were abnormal in their procedure, as in 1444, when Father John Boquardi resigned the office of confessor general and Father Magnus Unonis was elected in his place, "the greater part of the Sisters dissenting, but the abbess and the fathers and the saner part of the nuns made the election according to the rule." The Bishop was asked to confirm the election, but on account of this dissension refused to do so. On the 7th of October he came himself to Vadstena to investigate the matter, and since the abbess and part of the Sisters agreed to the choice of Father Magnus, he at last consented.

In 1456, on September 20, Sister Cecilia Pedersdotter was elected abbess on account of her piety as well as for her great talents, but neither reasoning, exhortation nor blame could induce her to accept the office. She hid in corners for everal hours. A few days later another attempt was made to elect an abbess, and they chose Caterina Ulphsdotter, one of the senior nuns, but the confessor general would not give his consent, saying that she was too old, so the election was postponed for a few days, but at length he approved of Caterina. We learn from a note by Benzelius that in the year 1457 half a page was torn from the original diary concerning the resignation of this abbess and the reëlection of Ingeborg, aunt of King Christian, who remained in office till her death in 1465, on October 14. Her death caused a good deal of difficulty in the selection of her successor.

The diary says that some days after her death the confessor general, Father Magnus, gave an exhortation to all the Brothers and Sisters on the election of the new abbess, and he was answered that they all wished to take a few days to deliberate on the subject, which was allowed. The seniors and the greater part of both communities for certain reasons not disclosed decided that on no account were they willing to elect another abbess until the confessor general resigned his own office entirely. When Father Magnus heard this a great dissension arose between the Brothers and Sisters, and in consequence the election was postponed for a long time, until November 10, when, in the presence of the Dean of Linkoping and two canons, it was totally put an end to in the parlor of the fathers, and the following day the prioress was elected as abbess, and she was elected peacefully by scrutiny.

Father Magnus resigned his office in December of the same year. He died in 1470, and we read that he had labored very hard for the preservation of the order, both in Rome and in other monasteries of the order, and, moreover, had successfully defended the revelations of St. Bridget against her adversaries.

Enough has now been quoted of the entries concerning the smaller world of the monastery, which be it said was a great place of pilgrimage in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. We will now turn to more historical records.

Knowing the turbulence which prevailed in the northern nations of those days, we are not surprised to find that wars and rebellions were of frequent occurrence, and the noise they occasioned reached the ears of those behind the enclosure of the monastery. In 1389 we read of a great battle in West Gothland between King Albert and the nobles of the kingdom of Sweden, who had confederated with the Danes, with whose help they conquered miraculously, nevertheless, God's grace protecting them. In this war the King himself was taken prisoner and his son Eric and two other generals whom he had brought with him from Germany. Many of the nobles on his side were also taken prisoners and many killed. Then Queen Margaret, daughter of Waldemar, King of the Danes, began to reign over the three kingdoms (Norway, Sweden and Denmark), and then the Germans being expelled, the Danes obtained the country for many years, and, concludes the writer, apparently ironically, "the Germans are blessed by the inhabitants of the land," for it is plain that all his sympathies were on the side of the Danes.

The canonization of St. Bridget at Rome in 1391 is described at great length in the diary, as is also the translation of her relics to Vadstena two years later, when Queen Margaret obtained from Pope Boniface IX. a year's jubilee for the monastery, which for a whole month after brought a large concourse of people there.

In the year 1400 King Eric reached his majority, having attained his eighteenth year. Up to that time, says the diary, Queen Margaret had ruled over the three kingdoms. In the year 1409 mention is made of the general council held at Pisa, where the rival Popes, Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., were condemned and convicted of heresy and the true Pope, Peter of Candia, Bishop of Milan, who was first a friar of the order of Friars Minor, was elected and took the name of Alexander V.

The writer of this diary, like many other mediæval chroniclers, dismisses historical events of the greatest importance very often in a few words. Thus we find at the end of the year 1410 we read that a tremendous battle was fought between the King of Poland and the cross-bearers of Prussia, where the latter were defeated amid the greatest slaughter. In memory of the victory fought in this place, Gooneveldt, or Grünveldt, King Ladislas wished to erect a monastery of the order of St. Bridget, which favor the Bishop of Pomerania granted in a letter sent to the camp before Marienberg on September 10, 1401. Evidently in the opinion of the chronicler the foundation of a new monastery is more important than the battle which led up to it. In 1413 King Eric V. made his first visit to Vadstena since he succeeded to the government of the three kingdoms, and we read that he came with great devotion, for he came on foot from Skening to the monastery, and he showed great familiarity to both the monks and the nuns, and he promised to complete the building of the church at Vadstena. He also promised "that he would build a new monastery of the order of St. Saviour in Laaland, which Queen Margaret had begun before her death, and he begged the confessor general and the Brothers that he might enter the monastery to see in what form and on what plan the new convent should be built. And as it was difficult for him to be admitted alone, he entered with the Archbishop of Lund and inspected everything and went out with great consolation, promising to love and promote the order as much as he could."

In 1415 the illustrious Queen Philippa came to Vadstena for the second time since her marriage, and the Saturday following she was shown the relics in the presence of all the fathers, with whom she spoke, and the next day she came back and asked to be received as an extern Sister, like the late Queen Margaret.

On March 10 that same year King Eric is described as "entering the cloisters (ambitum) and enclosure (pomerium) of the fathers, for what reason is not known, but he went out presently." We can well imagine what a sensation this royal visit would cause in the monastery.

In 1417 King Eric is said to have "sailed with a large fleet against the town of Schleswig, which he took with the son of King Albert and others, and if he had opposed with the same force the castle of Gothorp he would have taken that." On November 10 of this year Martin V. ascended the Pontifical throne and ended the most pernicious schism in the Church, which had lasted nearly forty years.

In 1419 a certain quarrel between the King and the Archbishop of Upsala is mentioned, and we learn that the King convoked a meeting of prelates and councillors in Denmark to settle it, and that John Berechini, the Archbishop, was detained in prison, but he escaped and went to Rome and lodged a complaint against the King and against his chapter. This Berechini had formerly been the King's secretary and a great favorite with His Majesty.

Two years later the King came to Vadstena to hold a discussion about their quarrel with the Archbishop and his chapter, at which the Archbishop of Riga was present as a delegate from the Holy See and a great many other Bishops and prelates, but the complaints prevailing the Archbishop resigned. Then ensued a dispute about his successor, ending in the King selecting from three candidates one of the Vadstena monks, Father John Haquin.

In the night of January 6, 1430, died Queen Philippa, and she was buried at Vadstena, in the royal chapel of St. Anne, which she had herself built. "She was the mother and most faithful protectrix of our monastery and order." In these few words is the celebrated Queen of English birth dismissed, whose death was mourned by the whole of the north of Europe.

Nine years after the Queen's death a rebellion arose against the King constituting Nicholas Stenson Marschall of the kingdom and counselling the people to obey him in all things. This was on the 12th of April, and that same day the church of the monastery was broken into just as the fathers were about to say Vespers, and the chest where some of the ecclesiastical treasures were kept was broken into and an attempt made to break down the door into the nun's convent by some of Eric Stenson's friends, who in consequence were excommunicated from the pulpit. On January 6, 1440, a meeting was held at Arboga and Christopher, the nephew of Eric, now deposed, was elected in his stead. In 1445 is briefly stated that the marriage of King Christopher with Queen Dorothea took place on September 16, when she was crowned.

King Christopher died at the early age of twenty-eight, on January 5, 1448, and on the 20th of January Charles Knutson was elected, which, the diary says, caused a dissension between Denmark and Sweden. But we have not space here to enter into the further troubles which followed. Enough has been quoted to show the impression historical events made on the writers of this interesting diary, of which we now take leave.

DARLEY DALE.

CHRISTIANITY AND ART.

DURING the last four centuries no art has been so severely criticized as Christian art. First of all, critics questioned whether it was an art at all; then those who answered in the affirmative were called on to say whether it was Christian art. The first question is no longer asked, and, notwithstanding the flux and reflux of critics' opinions, it is by no means proven that the best talent of the Middle Ages was no more than the originator of show-cards. Boileau, in certain literary principles which he would willingly have applied to art in general, thought he could deny to Christianity the capacity of attaining to artistic effects. But his reason for saying so was just as absurd as his arrogant assertion—namely, that the Gospel was devoid of æstheticism.

It is evident that an assertion like his depends on the notion one has formed of what art really is. Bossuet, in a moment of deplorable misconception, defined art as "the embellishment of nature." For he not only circumscribed the object of art, limiting it to the reproduction of idealized exterior forms, but he also falsified its philosophic basis. Even if it be true that art, as a result of certain of its modes of manifesting itself, assumes the aspect of a triumphal *apotheosis* of physical beauty, it is nevertheless primarily and necessarily the representation of the ideal beauty—the reflex of perfect beauty. Hence to confine art within the narrow limits of the "fine arts" would be to delete great and important departments of art and restrain it within a domain altogether too restricted.

Adhering, therefore, to the wider and truer conception of art, it may not be devoid of interest to consider it under a twofold aspect—as the tangible representation, so to speak, of ideas through the medium of the fine arts and an influence wrought by the Christian ideal on painting and sculpture.

Let us then examine what Christianity has given to art by leading art to the conception of the immaterial good and beautiful, and thus converting it into the indefatigable propagator of the *"Bonum Nuntium"* and the commentator, sometimes ingenuous and familiar, but always faithful and sincere, of the dogma and spirit of the Church.

Speaking of art among the ancients, it may justly be reduced to those sublime productions which Greece has handed down to us. In their efforts towards the realization of the beautiful the Greeks synthetized all the perfection that antiquity could imagine or execute. To them art truly meant the embellishment of nature—nature idealized. Their artists, sculptors, poets, completely absorbed in their love of the beautiful, loved it even to immorality, and so infatuated did they become with the desire for perfection in the human form and figure that they deemed those worthy of death who were so unfortunate as to be born ill-formed—a sentence advocated by Plato, whom Victor Cousin proclaimed "the greatest moralist that ever lived."

Plato maintains this view in his "Republic," and, as we know, he intended this imaginary "Republic" to be the ideal of a perfect republic. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that he would have accepted the application of that inhuman law at Athens, and that in formulating it he may be taken as simply the interpreter of the general opinion.

We should observe that among the Greeks excessive love of the beautiful extended only to physical beauty. Some chosen minds did indeed arrive at a vague notion of moral goodness and beauty, but they had to take every precaution to prevent the disclosure of their secret. They might discourse in private on that being, divine and immaterial, which is so beautifully spoken of in the "*Convivium*," but they never dreamed of going forth to proclaim their beliefs and opinions in the Agora. Socrates forfeited his life because he had ventured too far in this direction, and Phidias, their greatest artist, was, it is said, poisoned at the instigation of the priest of Neptune, because, following the philosophical teachings of Anaxagoras, he had been rash enough to reveal in his statues of Pallas and Jupiter his notion of the principle of the unity of the Godhead, which was so directly opposed to the traditional teogony.

In any event, such an idea of the Godhead was too indefinite and difficult to be generally accepted by a people habituated to a choice of gods. Their minds were fixed on earth, their aspirations never soared above the platform. Their gods were no way better than themselves and were notorious for the unlawful deeds and atrocious crimes attributed to them. There were few refining or sublime elements in their religion to raise them to the contemplation of anything more noble than an earthly hero or more worthy of emulation than the development of a powerful arm or the amassing of a handsome fortune.

Herein lies the inferiority of antiquity. By reason of this want of ideal they were led to accept brute force for government and the embellishment of nature for art itself.

Platonic philosophy, acceptable to those select few, was destined to be rejected by the less refined and to remain unknown to the uneducated masses. The ancients were too deeply enveloped in their beliefs as to the reality and power of Jupiter, and the beauty of Venus and her charms, to tolerate the introduction of a new and far-fetched theory regarding the existence of an immaterial, infinite and eternal being, whom they were to acknowledge and worship without beholding. Hence the materialism of their religion—they preferred to bow before what was great and mighty in nature and to adore only what they saw with the eyes of the body.

A religion such as this was unable to elevate the artist beyond the imitation and embellishment of nature. The artist's highest aim was to reproduce the figure, not as it was in reality, but as it was imagined according to a type materially more perfect. Acting on this standard, they labored to rectify the imperfections in nature and to secure a more exact proportion, a greater harmony and a more perfect whole than mother nature actually gave them. But while they expended their efforts in attempts to attain the beautiful, they neglected that which would have actually led them along the road to perfection—the expression of internal beauty.

Art in their hands, therefore, merely sought to make up for the absence of the higher ideal by the rhythm of a phrase, the grace and harmony of lines. Knowing no such ideal, it was unable to derive therefrom that increase in power of expression which imparts to works of religious art something of that ideal perfection which speaks to us of the divine and infinite.

This was precisely what Christianity gave to art. It extended the field of psychological observation, creating, as it were, new feelings, new ideas and new virtues, all of which were in due time to exert a powerful influence on artistic conceptions and productions.

Christianity of its very nature was bound to exercise an influence on art, not only as a system of philosophy and morality, but also as a distinct religion. The effects of its influence are discernible not only in the works of those who were born under the shadow of the Church, whose years of active labor were spent in the profession of her dogmas and in obedience to her dictates, and whose frail humanity in declining years was strengthened by the consolations she afforded, but also in the works of others, who first saw the light and were educated without her pale, and whose lives were spent in the uninspiring atmosphere of an alien religion. Not only on these had the Christian religion an elevating influence, but it even affected those who regarded all beliefs as the mere effervescence of over-credulous minds.

The reason and explanation of this influence is to be found in the dominant spirit of the Christian religion—the spirit of love. Granting that in its modes of external manifestation art is the reproduction of the beautiful, it nevertheless has love as its philosophical, primary and fundamental principle. A recent author, writing on the subject, gives the ultimate analysis of art as "love expressed in form." If this be true, as it seems to be, it was therefore natural that Christianity, whose teachings are entirely directed towards man's love for God, for his neighbor and for himself, should exercise a direct and powerful influence on art.

With the downfall of the Roman Empire art sank into neglect and oblivion. Its cultivators and admirers were gone; its patrons had been swept away in the general overturning of social order, and art perished with them. In such times as those, what was it that induced so many Christians to take up the practice of a calling no longer in demand, except, indeed, by those who could ill afford to be patrons? What but love! Love of God and the mysteries of faith inundated their hearts and inebriated their souls, and they strove to manifest that love in exterior forms, to infuse into a combination of colors some of the fire that burned in their own hearts. True, the grace and purity of their lines were not such as antiquity would have demanded, but there was a soul, a living soul, that spoke to the beholder from the inanimate colors—an effect the works of the ancients had never been able to produce.

The influence of religion on art, then, is exercised by the impulse of love and by the transmission of new principles, which branded certain virtues of paganism as vices and raised to the dignity of the highest virtues ideals and practices that had been regarded as despicable by the ancients. At the same time, as the outcome of the introduction of new ideas—the law of Universal Brotherhood, for example, which involved the abolition of slavery and the rehabilitation of degraded human nature and the belief in the immortality of the soul—and of the modification of the aspirations and the tendencies of the mind, religion introduced art into a new territory unknown to even the most refined spirits of antiquity, and held out to it the spiritual and the infinite as an object and a model.

Before proceeding farther it might be well to set forth for all a conception of "religious art." Beaumarchais says that the name is one of these "big words" that are oftentimes misused. It is applied to various classes and kinds of work. For some persons it is sufficient for a work to speak in vague terms of religion, for a picture or bas-relief to represent a scene taken from Scripture or from the lives of the saints, to designate it as a work of religious art. This plainly is an error. Art must not be taken to include those strange productions which form a special category of their own called objects of devotion, in which, as a rule, there is little more of religious art than the name and, perhaps, the good intention. A work of religious art is a work of art which, in virtue of the impression it makes on the mind, leads to the contemplation of God in one or more of His attributes, directly or indirectly—by the fulfillment, for example, of one of His commandments or by some particular act of religion.

It should be observed that, owing to the intensity of the religious sentiment in the works of the primitive Christians, many critics are unwilling to admit a work to this category if it is not redolent of mysticism. Such an opinion seems to us groundless, for we might as well say that sanctity is not sanctity without mysticism as to say that mysticism is a necessary condition in a work of religious art. It may, indeed, be admitted that the mystic element is generally to be found in such art productions, but despite this an expression of physical suffering on the face of Christ on the Cross, or on the countenance of His Holy Mother as she gazes on the tortured limbs of her beloved Son, would in no way detract from them; on the contrary, the representation gains in truthfulness. On the other hand, a painting portraying the suffering humanity of Christ without revealing a ray of His divinity would not only be untrue, but irreligious. Should we adopt this as our criterion and accord the title "religious art" only to the works which produce a like emotion in us, we would wipe out from the lists of religious art many of the productions that are generally classified in that noble category.

"While ancient Rome," says Henry Bullinger, "refused to repent and be converted to Christ, forsaking her gods and her superstitions, she was at last condemned by Christ, according to a just law of retaliation; for with the measure used by Rome towards other nations, with the same did the nations measure back to Rome." Long had the ancient queen of empire looked out, as if from a tower of security, upon the calamities that overwhelmed her provinces and tore away her conquests. But instead of being alarmed, her proud heart seemed to dilate at each new disaster, for in proportion as the empire diminished her wealth increased. "She could not believe her eyes when she beheld the fierce bands of Alaric, impatient for the moment of assault, come bursting through the pleasure gardens and suburban villas—rushing, thundering over every obstacle till they burst against her walls like the maddened and infuriated against the bars of his prison, their hearts full of rage and their battle-axes thirsting for the blood of the Roman."

"The first emotions of the nobles and people," says Gibbon, "were those of surprise and indignation that a vile barbarian should dare to insult the capital of the world. But their arrogance was soon humbled by misfortune."

The moment had come—Rome's moment. It was the most important of her existence. The belief cherished by herself, and not less remembered by her enemies—the belief in her indestructibility—was shattered. Alaric came a second time. The thunder-cloud had burst, and Goths, Visigoths, Huns and Vandals swept, as does the mountain torrent, down from their northern fastnesses into the fertile plains and smiling cities of Italy. City after city was dismantled, destroyed, annihilated. The dreadful hordes of barbarians—brutal Goth and hideous Hun, men without religion, men without education, men without civilization, men without mercy, men without a written language, men without a single refining element amongst them—came down in their thousands of warriors, blighting the country as they passed and enthroning desolation on the seats of wealth and plenty, planting the barrenness of ignorance in the select garden of civilization and carrying slavery and destruction in their train. Rome, great Imperial Rome, sank before them. They plundered her sanctuaries, dashed her gods to pieces, and what escaped the first fury of the inundation perished in those that followed. The aspect of the empire was that of a wilderness. She was left prostrate, lifeless like an enormous skeleton.

Attila was next to seek the plunder of Rome by the power of the brawny arms and the savage hearts of his brutal Huns. "A ferocious delight in cruel massacre," says Miley, "and in changing the most populous and happy scenes of civilized life into a resemblance of their native deserts was the characteristic of their race. Such were the invaders now hastening to complete for the 'Seven-Hilled City' what had been left unfinished by the Goths. Their King, Attila, who had acquired for himself the title of 'The Scourge of God,' was followed by no less than 500,000 of these demons in human form, and it was his boast that wherever his horse once trod the grass never grew again. Not only did the human race vanish before this minister of destruction, but every monument and vestige of civilized existence disappeared as his legions swept over them."

No army could withstand, no legion confront them. Before their tread all went down into misery and slavery, if they had been unfortunate enough to outlive the contest. Every art, every science, every sign and token of civilization perished. Every institution disappeared or was destroyed save one—one solitary bulwark withstood the assault and met the oncoming foe. The feeble, unarmed old man, Pope Leo the Great, stood alone to fight the battle for civilization. Even the historian of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," unwittingly perhaps, exhibits the divine influence of Christianity and cannot deny the fact of "the veneration of Attila for the spiritual father of Christendom." Attila retired amid the rage and execrations of his savage followers, and Rome, with all her art treasures, was saved.

Christianity had proved itself the barrier against which the fury of the victorious barbarians was to be quelled. It gathered together the scattered elements of the ancient civilization and snatched up the records of a submerged antiquity. The monuments, the works, the creations of wisdom and human genius were collected and preserved by her with reverent veneration.

In the overturning of the ancient world art was the first to perish. But Christianity, in giving to the minds of its followers a higher ideal, created anew the desire within them for the works of the poet's fancy, of the painter's brush and the sculptor's chisel. The ideal was changed, and the new art became essentially religious. Art had now the way clear before her to noblest flights. She could hover among the clouds, converse with the saints, sing songs of praise with the angels; nay, reflect the Almighty and the Infinite. What antiquity had cherished as its own was now to receive a new dress and stand forth robed in garments woven from the Christian imagination and haloed by the light of heaven.

There is no need here to speak at length of the various paintings in the Catacombs, principally because the circumstances of time and place necessarily constrained the young Christian artist to peculiarities which in later times and under other auspices speedily disappeared.

But even in the Catacombs may be observed the first flowers of the plant that is seen in the full bloom of its beauty in the course of the Middle Ages. "The study of the liturgical representations," says De Rossi in "Roma Sotterranea," "confirms the observations already made on the order in which the progressive development of Christian art was brought about, the symbol quietly disappearing, while the representation of historical facts was step by step assuming its proper place." Every picture in the Catacombs has not, however, all the characteristics of Christian art. Some—though they are very few—represent mythological scenes, but were employed by their authors to recall to the minds of the Christians certain mysteries or dogmas of the Church.

While admitting the truth of the remark made by Raoul Rochette, "un art ne s'improvise pas"—no school of art can be produced of a sudden, "springing into existence fully formed, like Minerva from the brain of Jupiter"—still one cannot follow him all through his theory. He carried it too far in insisting that there was always a direct, positive influence exercised by the pagan models on each Christian production, and much more in saying that the imitation of the pagan works was evident not only in the principal features of the work or its modeling, but also in the details of the individual composition. He thought the Christians were even guided in the selection of their subjects by the pagans, and that the former were so servile in their imitation that they allowed themselves to be led away from the teachings of their Divine Master. These opinions were afterwards quoted as arguments by Charles Maitland, M. D., in his book, "The Church in the Catacombs," and served up as authorities to establish his preconceived conclusions regarding the Catholic Church and her dogmas.

The cause of Rochette's error seems to be a collection of paintings of a semi-pagan character published by Bottari and by him attributed to a Christian Catacomb. It is no longer doubted that the cemetery alluded to was a construction belonging to the Gnostic sects. Hence the mixture of paganism and Christianity therein exhibited can no longer offer any difficulty. "Roma Sotterranea" says: "In the genuine paintings of the Christian Catacombs nothing whatever of this kind has ever been found. The only mythical personage who appears in paintings is the Thracian Orpheus, charming the wild beasts with his lyre. . . . His taming of the wild beasts was taken as a faint shadow of our Lord's softening the hard hearts of men by the persuasive sweetness of His preaching." And the placing of the pipe in the hands of Christ—the Good Shepherd—was no thoughtless or profane adaptation of one of the *insignia* of Pan, but, being an ordinary adjunct of shepherds, it had a special significance, a certain dogmatic value when referred to the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls. "The sheep follow the shepherd because they know his voice."

One mark distinguishes all the paintings of the Catacombs, based on the recognition of the law of pardon of injuries. It consists in never representing the inhuman treatment suffered by the early martyrs at the hands of the tormentors. The painters of the time of the persecutions pass in silence over the brutality of the executors, and never refer to it even by chance. Only in the fifth century—with one solitary exception in the fourth—when all was over, did they begin to represent those scenes of bloodshed and horror. But that was a time when the martyr's death could no longer excite the anger of friends, and, on the contrary, would serve as glorious examples of Christian patience and suffering. The one exception referred to is, as De Rossi says, a strange fact for those times and is one of the most illustrious examples of early Christian art that aims at reproducing the most sublime flights of the Christian soul inspired by faith, and the serene magnanimity of Christ's martyrs in the presence of their persecutors."

This was precisely what painting attempted and oftentimes actually effected in the Middle Ages, but during that epoch there was a potent auxiliary at work, of which the artists of the Catacombs were unable to avail themselves. Sculpture was this helper, and great things were done in it which could not have been dreamed of in the earlier ages, owing to the circumstances in which the artists of the subterranean cemeteries worked.

The unity that Christianity brought with it brought mediæval Europe under the same moral law, under the same religious belief. In this unity art gained an element of strength. The principle of love united the scattered elements and gathered the different styles under one roof and turned all in the same direction. Prior to this art had been divided up into particular and distinct styles, which had become part and parcel of the peoples to whom they belonged and by whom they were practiced. We must not be understood as speaking of a fusion of all the schools of painting as we understand this term to-day. Genius will naturally have its own peculiarities and nations and peoples their own predilections, and there will, therefore, forever remain those dictinctions between school and school, period and period; but the universal spread of Christianity exercised an influence in bringing about a harmony of expression, a unity of spirit and conception, all of which were effected by the change of ideal. The work of art thenceforth was to render visible the revolution that the religion of Christ had wrought in the hearts of men.

In the ancient order art was exclusively national. It was fruitless to attempt to establish comparisons or seek relationship between Egyptian and Grecian art, the art of the Etruscans and that of the Romans. But from the Middle Ages down to our own days we easily trace the similarities and differences between Italian and French, and even between these and Byzantine work, which marks the departure from the more or less stereotyped models of early Christian artists, as the renunciation of the Byzantine traditional methods by Cimabue signalizes the creation of the Florentine school.

There was a certain class of persons—and they are far from being yet converted to truth—who, through polemical meanness, tried to represent the Middle Ages as a period of unrivaled ignorance, of intellectual retrogression, an epoch in which the brutal and vicious passions of men unrefined by the least intellectual good reigned supreme. Such persons, however, were, as their followers are to-day, either sadly deficient in historical knowledge or the victims of prejudice and delusion. The Middle Ages was an epoch of the revindication of right against the power of might, and it would be easy to convince ourselves of the fact by the mere enumeration of the questions in which the leading men of the period were actively engaged. No other period—not even the eighteenth century, which is called not an epoch of crises, but a crisis itself—no other period can show the proofs of such intellectual activity and vitality, and in vain shall we seek among the modern productions for an equal for the works of the master minds of the Middle Ages. Many have preferred to deny the claims of the Middle Ages and "dub" them the "Dark Ages" of progress and civilization, rather than be compelled to recognize the influence of the Catholic Church and accord her the glory, which is hers by every right—the glory of having created, in spite of the bitterest opposition and at the cost of long-continued struggles, the civilization of which the modern world reaps the benefit.

"Abstractedly from all the influences which we have sustained in common with the rest of the civilized commonwealth," says Sir Francis Palgrave, "our British disparagement of the Middle Ages has been exceedingly enhanced by our grizzled ecclesiastical or church historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These "standard works," accepted and received as canonical books, have tainted the nobility of our national mind. An adequate parallel to their bitterness, their shabbiness, their shirking, their habitual disregard of honor and veracity, is hardly afforded even by the so-called "anti-Jacobin" during the revolutionary and imperial wars.

No one who reads the history of art during the Middle Ages can deny to the Church the glory of having fostered it at its birth, nourished it through the years of its tenderness and then led it to the perfection of all that had been seen before. Writing in her "Legends of the Monastic Orders," Mrs. Jameson speaks of the cloisters and their inhabitants thus: "There, learning trimmed her lamp; there, contemplation plumed her wings; there, the traditions of art, preserved from age to age by lonely, studious men, kept alive in form and color the idea of a beauty beyond that of earth—of a might beyond that of the spear and the shield—of a divine sympathy with human suffering."

"As we advance into the Middle Ages," says Henry Giles, "we observe the Christian idea unfolding itself in art of imposing majesty and of exceeding beauty. First, naturally in architecture. The architecture which ultimately prevailed in the sacred buildings of Western Europe was that which we call Gothic. . . . The distinctive spirit which pervades all its forms is what we have to consider. That, I would say, was the spirit of mystery and of aspiration. A Gothic Cathedral seemed to be an epitome of creation. In its vastness it was a sacramental image of the universe; in its diversity it resembled nature, and in its unity it suggested God. But it suggested man, too. It was the work of man's hands, shaping the solemn vision of his soul into embodied adoration. It was, therefore, the grandest symbol of union between the divine and human which imagination ever conceived, which art ever moulded, and it was in being symbolic of such union that it had its Christian peculiarity. The mould of its structure was a perpetual commemoration of Christ's sufferings and a sublime publication of His glory. Its ground plan in the figure of a cross was emblematic of Calvary. Its pinnacles, which tapered through the clouds and vanished into light, pointed to those heavens to which the Crucified had ascended."

And speaking further on about the larger and more majestic Gothic structures, he says: "While the Cathedral gives us in one aspect a sense of sacred mystery, in another it gives us an impression of the boundless. Its awful spaces of naves and aisles carry our thoughts away into the amplitude of God's dominion. Its bold and lofty arches lift them up to the battlements of His throne. Was it not the soul, reaching to its sublimest strivings, which placed turret above tower and spire above turret, until the cross, over all, seemed to melt away into immortal light?"

The mysticism, the simplicity and profound faith of the Middle Ages began gradually to disappear before the Renaissance and remained dead as long as it lasted. The artists of the latter period possessed, if we might so express it, a more perfect pencil, their technique was more elaborate, but their productions were wanting in expression and truth, and we believe that from its deficiency in these qualities—for we must not forget the dictum of Cousin, "expression is the supreme law in art"—the art of the Renaissance lost as much as it gained in elegance and outward grandeur. In addition to this we consider the Renaissance as much a renewal of a reawakening to paganism as to interest in and the perfection of art. Faith had lost the vigor of the Middle Ages when it led men—great men and masters in their profession—to consecrate their lives to the production of those works the excellence and superiority of which is acknowledged by every one not so utterly saturated by sordid materialism as to see in a pagan model nothing wanting which is triumphantly supplied in its Christian successor. Those men worked for the glory of God; they painted a Virgin not for the sake of putting on canvas a beautiful woman with some traces of sensual beauty, whose head they enshrined in a halo of thin heavenly light, but to honor the Virgin Mother of their God by their efforts to appreciate and represent, as far as possible, her immense graces and prerogatives. The artists of the Renaissance, on the contrary, were artists for art's sake.

The return towards antiquity had early made an impression on many minds and had proved harmful to religion. We do not, however, agree with those who say that therein was to be found a cause of the Reformation, or even a reason why the so-called reformers succeeded in making a considerable number of perverts within a short space of time. The history of the period, we think, goes rather to show that the movement initiated in art was simply a parallel to others at work in the various domains of religion and science, and was nothing more than the natural outcome of the condition of the popular mind at the time.

The Renaissance—incapable of creating better for itself—looked back to antiquity for its model, and then devoted its talents to the perfection of the pagan relic. The workers of the Middle Ages, on the contrary, abandoned the barren soil of antiquity, and, soaring into the ethereal regions of Christian ideal, penetrated within the realms of heaven itself and represented to us on earth a reflection, as it were, of the beauty "that eye hath not seen nor ear heard." If the artists of the Renaissance had found for themselves an original ideal and, instead of borrowing from the ancients, had broken into territory unapproached by Gothic art, they would have made us their debtors; but they have only given us a mere imitation. And "it is hard to say," writes a recent author on this question, "that the impotence of the present day to produce a decent original work might not be traced to the false lead taken by the Renaissance."

Real expression in art disappeared with the rise of the Renaissance. Neither Raphael nor Vinci nor Michelangelo put into their works the soul-stirring expression of the Middle Ages. We readily admit that the Virgins of Raphael are perfect in form and delightfully ideal, but what a different impression is left upon us by a painting of the Virgin by Fra Angelico or Cimabue!

There are many good authorities on Christian art who hold that the Renaissance really meant the destruction of art in succeeding generations. The perfect proportions, the purity of lines and the finished beauty of the works of the great masters of that period have given the lead in a direction whither their successors have been unable to follow. The barrenness of our own days affords food for serious reflection.

What a striking comparison between this and the influence exercised by the Catholic Church! She raised up and preserved the prostrate remains of pagan art and brought forth a new art peculiar to herself, possessing the qualities and requisite for the imitation of the most exalted ideals. Such was her triumph during the Middle Ages! The changed spirit of succeeding generations brought about a great change in art, but it is also remarkable that the decline in art dates from the time when it was torn from the fostering care of the venerable institution which had restored it to life and guided it to its highest flights. With every reason, therefore, can it be claimed that the Catholic Church is the mother and the inspirer of art.

HUGH THOMAS.

Rome.

IRISH CATHOLICS IN THE REIGN OF CHARLES II.

A CONSIDERABLE degree of light is cast upon the actual condition of the Catholics of Ireland during a portion of the reign of Charles II. by one of the latest volumes of the "Calendar of State Papers," published under the supervision of the English Master of the Rolls.[1] The circumstances prevailing in Ireland at the time within which the documents reproduced or epitomized in the collection before us were of a nature well calculated to embarrass the wisest of statesmen. In order to enable understanding of their complexity it is absolutely necessary to recall the main events of the years immediately preceding. Throughout the long conflict between Charles I. and his rebellious subjects in England and Scotland, which eventuated in his execution at Whitehall and the establishment in London of a republican form of government with Cromwell presiding under the title of Lord Protector, the great majority of the nobility and gentry of Ireland had stood steadfastly by the Stuart monarch, while at the same time claiming full freedom to practice the religion of their forefathers and full liberty of legislation for the ancient Parliament of the Lords and Commons of Ireland. Stated broadly, these were the principles maintained by the Catholic Confederation of Kilkenny, with the approval of the Papal Nuncio, Mgr. Rinuccinni, and in support of which that splendid soldier, Owen Roe O'Neill, fought and died.

---

[1] "Calendar of State Papers Relating to Ireland Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1666-1669," edited by Robert Pentland Mahaffy. Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office, London.

The great victory of Benhurb was rather a triumph over the Scottish Presbyterian rebels against the English King than over the forces of England, and Owen Roe was dead before opportunity came for measuring his genius with that of the Brewer of Huntingdon. Ireland has small reason to reverence the memory of Cromwell, and she is little likely to ever do so, but it is impossible to refrain from noting the marvelous capacity with which that mere bourgeois civilian mastered the arts of war and legislation. That he conquered and subdued Catholic Ireland is as unquestionable as that Mahomet overthrew the dynasty of the Greek Emperors of Constantinople. The Catholic owners of the soil of the three provinces of Ulster, Leinster and Munster were practically all deprived of their properties therein and either driven into exile on the Continent or compelled to take up their abodes in the most barren and inhospitable portions of the province of Connaught. All the more fertile portions of the country were conferred either on Cromwell's generals, officers and soldiers, or on those English adventurers who had subscribed moneys to defray the expenses of his campaign on the security of the territories which it was assured his sword would win and divide among them. The assumption proved correct. The English speculators who backed Cromwell—to use a sporting similia—backed the winning horse. The result was to create for Charles II. and his advisers a situation of the utmost complexity and difficulty.

On one side the moment the restoration of the monarchy was assured they were assailed by the claims of the Irish Catholic loyalists for the restitution of their confiscated estates. These had mainly been bestowed on English Protestants. To evict these would have been to create a new rebellion in England, and the King and his advisers were at their wits' end in seeking satisfactory solutions of the problem by which they were confronted. It must, moreover, be remembered that all the time Charles was a Catholic at heart, although a very graceless and opportunist one. Having recovered the throne of his ancestors, he was ready to sacrifice all his personal sympathies in order to retain it. Through purely selfish motives he refrained from imposing any real check on the religious frenzy which seized his English subjects, under the monstrous influence of that false and perjured miscreant, Titus Oates. Influenced by the same base purposes, he refused to interfere to prevent the martyrdom of the Blessed Oliver Plunkett, Primate of All Ireland and Archbishop of Armagh. In this respect, as in many others, Charles II. was immensely inferior in nobility of character to his father, who undoubtedly sacrificed his life and crown through steadfast adherence to the religious and regal principles he felt bound to maintain. Charles II.—as the world judges—was a wiser man than either his father or his brother, James II., who succeeded him, but he must always have carried an uneasy conscience, the constant torment of which not improbably induced indulgence in the debaucheries and dissipations which have cast a lasting blemish on his name. The King wanted release from thought, and he found it in shameful excesses, but the long stifled conscience triumphed in the end, and he died, as he should have lived, a Catholic, repenting his sins. With all his faults, however, the Merry Monarch was himself no persecutor. He was merely a base opportunist. He could not possibly desire the persecution of the courageous professors of a creed in which he personally secretly believed, but if his Protestant subjects were bent on persecuting them, he had no mind to stand in their way and thus endanger the crown he had so lately and so marvelously recovered. When Charles II. was content to adopt such a timorous and time-serving attitude in regard to the Catholics of England it was, of course, hopeless to expect that he would assume a nobler one in defense of those of Ireland, the more especially as the rendering of full justice to them would almost certainly have been misrepresented in the sister kingdom as the infliction of injustice and spoliation on the Protestant colonists and grantees in the latter country. The Marquis of Ormond,[2] who was the King's Lord Deputy or Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, was fully cognizant of His Majesty's views and policy, and was careful to govern his own actions by the knowledge he possessed. It will be easily recognized that the circumstances thus briefly epitomized were of a kind certain to prove productive of embarrassments of the gravest possible nature for the Sovereign, for his Deputy and his Irish Catholic subjects, who were honestly desirous of maintaining his rule in Ireland if only they were placed in a position to do so by the restitution of the possessions and revenues of which they had been deprived during the Cromwellian usurpation. A further complication was introduced by the fact that the landlords and farmers of England were earnestly desirous of preventing the importation into that country of Irish cattle. What came in later years to be styled the "agricultural interest" was up in arms against the competition in their home markets of their fellow-countrymen who had taken possession of the fertile grazing and tillage lands of Ireland in the belief that in the supplying of English needs they would find ample recompense for such monetary and personal risk. Cromwell had dispensed with an Irish Parliament and governed Ireland by laws made in London. Charles II. restored the ancient Parliamentary Constitution of the King, Lords and Commons of the country. Owing, however, to the enormous social changes wrought by conquest and confiscation, the Parliament which met in Dublin was essentially an English and Protestant one. Nevertheless, paradoxical though it may seem, its first conflict was with England, the jealousy of whose landocracy and their tenants had turned the Cromwellian settlers into patriots of a kind. Later on a somewhat similar spectacle was witnessed in the days of Swift, Lucas, Molyneux and Grattan.

---

[2] James Butler, afterwards Duke of Ormond, born in 1607, was, owing to the accidental death of his father by drowning in 1619, placed by the powers of the day in Protestant guardianship and brought up a Protestant. He was an able, if somewhat unscrupulous, statesman and a valiant soldier. To him both Charles I. and II. owed much, and had James II. been content to accept his opportunist councils the Stuarts might still be in possession of the throne of England. In 1641, with the consent of Charles I., the Parliament of that country appointed him to the command of the English forces in Ireland, confronted as they were by those of the Catholic Confederation. At this time his rank in the peerage was that of Earl of Ormond. He defeated the Catholics in several conflicts in which they had the misfortune to be commanded by General Preston, and in the following year entered into the famous truce with a section of their leaders, which led to the breaking up of the Confederation. This accomplished, he proceeded into England, where the Civil War had already begun, to assist the King. In 1643 Charles, who had created him Marquis of Ormond, appointed him Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, an office which he held until 1647, when, with the approval of the King, he surrendered it to commissioners appointed by the Parliament. His Majesty being now a prisoner, Ormond went to France, where he joined the Queen and Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. In 1648 he returned to Ireland and procured the proclamation of Charles II., in succession to his father, who had been executed. In 1650 he was again compelled to go into exile, all his estates being confiscated by the Cromwellian Government. On the Restoration his possessions were restored, and he was created an English peer and Duke of Ormond in the peerage of Ireland. In November, 1661, he was again appointed Lord Lieutenant, and retained that position until February, 1668, when he was deprived of it through the intrigues at the court of the Duke of Buckingham and other enemies. The Irish Parliament, exclusively Protestant and Cromwellian as it was, voted him a gratuity of £30,000 in recognition of his services, which mainly con-

So Mahaffy, the capable editor of the volume of state papers now before me, says in his preface, with reference to this incident:

> From the economic point of view the attitude of England was wholly indefensible. The injury done to Ireland was far greater than the advantage gained by England, and the waste of cattle and grazing land which the new act caused was immense. It is clear from the debates that these things were realized by many men in both Houses, and the records of the divisions on the bill show that opposition to it did not come from Ireland

---

sisted in preventing the restoration to the loyalist Irish Catholics of the properties confiscated by Cromwell. His dismissal from office caused him a loss of over £92,000 expended in the King's service, and it is computed that he spent altogether no less than £900,000 of his own money in support of the royal cause. As a result his closing days were clouded by money anxieties. In 1682 he was again made Lord Lieutenant, and held the position until he decided to break with James II., whose Catholic policy he regarded as impolitic in its precipitance. That was a correct view, the facts of history attest, although it is impossible not to admire the devotion of the last Stuart King of England to conscientious convictions. Ormond died on the 21st July, 1688, and was interred in Westminster Abbey.

alone. It is difficult from the evidence before me to estimate how far the bill was carried in order to raise the value of grazing land in England—the official reason given at the time—and how far it was due to a desire by Ormond's enemies to make his task in Ireland difficult, and even to cut away a source of his private income. The bill was prosecuted with great energy by Buckingham. "No one," he said, "could oppose it except he had either an Irish interest or an Irish understanding." He persuaded the House of Lords to accept the word "nuisance" against their better judgment, and threw himself into the question in a manner which, in men of his character, suggests a personal interest. The passage of the act practically meant the triumph of the Buckingham over the Clarendon and Ormond party at court. It meant also a great restraint upon Irish trade and delay in the settlement of the country, for which Ormond had so long and patiently labored.

That the Viceroy earnestly desired to secure the prosperity and tranquillity of the country he was appointed to rule is certain, but he was seriously hampered in giving effect to his good intentions not only by the selfishness of the English agricultural interests, but also by his Protestant inability to understand the trend of Catholic thought and doctrine in regard to the control and direction of ecclesiastical and spiritual concerns. In common with his royal master he accepted and acted on the ignorant theory that it might be possible to give freedom of religious worship to the Catholics of Ireland in a kind of schismatic national Church under the leadership of the King and rejecting the authority of the Pope. The notion was a silly one, which, if it had received priestly or popular acceptance, could only have resulted in the creation of a new form of heresy. It must be admitted, however, that the scheme had its attractions for a clergy and a people long subjected to a cruel persecution and denied all civil rights solely because of their persistent loyalty to the Holy See and the Vicar of Christ. It was a terrible temptation nobly resisted.

While the Catholic prelates and priests of the country were practically outlaws and existed only on sufferance, their poverty and fewness in number, however, in most instances obtaining for them a contemptuous tolerance, the Protestant Bishops—whatever may have been the case with their inferior clergy—undoubtedly enjoyed a good time. How good it was in many instances, regarded from a purely material standpoint, is indicated by a letter from the Protestant Bishop of Limerick to Lord Arlington, Secretary of State in London, applying for the then vacant Diocese of Derry. In this letter, dated 13th January, 1666, the applicant, Dr. William Fuller, tells his patron:

> Your lordship has often asked me wherein you may do me any good. An opportunity for doing so has now arrived. The Bishop of Derry is dead, and I hear the Lord Lieutenant recommends that Dr. Mossom, dean of Christchurch (Dublin), may succeed. I hope the King may not yet have consented, and, if not, I know my Lord of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor will use their uttermost endeavors that I may do so, the rather because three years ago, when the Bishop of Derry was very ill, the Lord Lieutenant promised that I should succeed him if he died then. I am sure it will be acceptable to the gentry in those parts.
>
> P. S.—I enclose part of a letter sent me from Dublin on the matter. If I

> be so unhappy as the nomination of Dr. Mossom be sent for Ireland, yet the pacquet usually staying at Holyhead for a fit wind, your lordship may either stop it there or remand it back again for my advantage.[3]

It is worthy of note that the writer of this appeal for preferment did not deem it even necessary to reside in Limerick, his letter being written from Farnham Castle, in Hampshire. Most of the Protestant prelates of Ireland were absentees. The communication received by Fuller from his friend in Dublin and transmitted to Arlington shows how lucrative was the post he sought. In part it was as follows:

> Before I had finished this letter the news of the death of the Bishop of Derry was brought to me, and, walking abroad to inform myself as to the condition of that bishopric, some great men of that country who are members of the House of Commons came to me and desired me earnestly to write to your lordship to accept of it, not doubting but that it would be offered to you. One of them, Captain Phillips by name, who is joint Register with Colonel Jeffreys, of the Court of Claims, told me that it is worth above £2,000 a year, for he says though the late Bishop made by his rent roll but £1,640 and £60 a year for the salmon fishing, yet to his knowledge the perquisites made it up £2,000 a year, and that the salmon fishing was worth near £300, though set so low, and protested if this might not be credited he would undertake out of his own estate to make it good to your lordship £2,000 per annum. You should try to get it. The Bishop has an excellent house in the town of Londonderry and another in the country in a pleasant place with plenty of English gentry about it.[4]

The sender of this friendly suggestion went on to say that if Fuller obtained the see he could import any clergymen he favored, as the advowsons or right of succession to all its parochial benefices would be in his gift. The post was evidently one well worth looking after. All along the line the story was the same. The Protestant prelates had the plunder of the lands at their disposal. On the 19th of February, 1666, the King wrote from Whitehall to Ormond, telling him:

> We have appointed Archbishop Boyle Lord Chancellor of Ireland, with all the usual powers, privileges, fees, etc., and find that in the late civil establishment in Ireland there was allowed to the late Lord Chancellor, Sir Maurice Eustace, the yearly fee of £1,000, and also the yearly sum of £809 17s. 6d., which sum was to continue to Sir Maurice during the grant, but to cease afterwards. To avoid any doubts which may arise as to whether we intended to grant both the £1,000 and the temporary allowance of £809 to Archbishop Boyle as Lord Chancellor, we now declare that it was our intention to grant both of them to him, and direct you to give warrants to the Vice Treasurer there accordingly; and the said allowances shall be inserted in the establishment. If the now Lord Chancellor desires patents for these payments, you shall cause them to be made and passed to him.[5]

The new Lord Chancellor was Dr. Michael Boyle, Archbishop of Dublin, and the collection of state papers from which we quote show him to have been a rapacious and unscrupulous grabber of all estates and revenues he could possibly lay hands on.

Meantime the intrigues to the detriment of religion as well as the personal and proprietorial injustices to which many of the Catholic loyalists were subjected had induced some of them to enter into a compact to stand by one another in defense of Catholic principles and in vindication of their claim for the restoration of their confiscated estates. In pursuance of this policy a solemn agreement for common action was drawn up and signed. A copy of this covenant soon came into the hands of Ormond, who endorsed it "Declaration of the Irish Rebels." The wording of the document shows it to have been drawn up either by a foreigner or by some one who had lived so long upon the Continent that his knowledge of English had become defective. The purpose of the declaration is, however, perfectly clear, and—whatever may be thought as to its wisdom or unwisdom—there can be no question as to the worthiness of the motives which inspired it. The following is the text, bearing the signatures of those who approved it:

---

[3] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," p. 4.

[4] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," p. 4.

[5] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," p. 40.

> Jesus. + Maria.
>
> "In the plain appearance of the Heavenly Throne and of the whole world, such of the subjects of England, Ireland and Scotland as have not only been promoters of usurped authorities of states, Commonwealth, Protector and Rump, and also actors in the murthering of the late King Charles, are thoroughly indempnified and in the possession of the estates of [us,] innocent Catholic subjects not concerned in the foul guile of any the aforesaid practices, nor for any other cause kept out of our estates and abridged of our due liberties, but for our being Papists. . . . By the late contrived rules made laws by a selected Parliament of the foresaid possessors themselves, certain Catholics were to be restored to their estates provided they should prove their innocency in such manner as by the said rules was prescribed." "Yet, fearing least Catholiques who might easily prove their loyalty to a King who was thereby obliged to see justice done them, might also—notwithstanding the bryery [thorny?] qualifications by the said selected Parliament contrived in the rules aforesaid and through which Catholics must pass, and notwithstanding their subordinating [suborning] for moneys great number of perjurers to be ready for swearing what they would have them declare to criminate Catholics—likewise make out their innocency in such manner as in the said contrived rules was prescribed," a time was limited in which claims must be put in and heard. The greater part of this time was expended by the judges in considering how to hear the claims of innocent Catholics, "or rather, if the naked truth was known, how to make them all innocent." By bribery the rich man was heard first at this court, even if he had a lame case, and the poor, however strong his case, had to wait till the period for hearing him was elapsed. "And if a man who hath been robbed of his cloak by a rebel against the King and his laws shall put the question—if he could not to-day have access to the judges for the thronging clamors of their subjects who also were robbed of many horses and cloaths, why not to-morrow? Who can say that the robber ought to have the cloak soon as to-morrow is come, since it is not the subject's fault he is not heard whilst to-day." [These] Acts [are] "so destestable that the very promoters of them do themselves detect the foulness and tyranny of them, witness these words of the Duke of Ormond in a late speech of his where he brands the precedent usurpers with the wicked practices of taking away the estates of several persons for no other cause but for their being Papists—a tyranny reasonably and justly hinted; but although he abhors it in other usurpers, yet finding it conduce to his party's profit; by himself [it is] now most exactly imitated and practiced.
>
> "We therefore do, in the name of Jesus Christ, under whose banner we resolve to live and die, unanimously declare that the Pope's Holiness is Supreme Head of Christ's Church militant on earth, and that with our swords drawn we will stand against and oppose [such] as believe the contrary and do so unjustly rob us of our due liberties of conscience and rights."

Myles Reyley
Hugh Reyley
Thomas Farrell
Richard Plunkett
Neil O'Neile
Con O'Neile
Faghny Farrell
Edmund Farrell
Walter Reignolds
Charles Hanly
Colonel McCawfill
Cahir Reily
Patrick Brady
Roger Philliips
Richard Flanigan

Teige Flanigan
Francis Rourke
Dudley Costellogh
Owen Brady
Edmund Nangle
Connor Hanly
Marcy Farrell
Gerald Farrell
William Farrell
James Rennolds
Francis Shanly
Charles Byrne
Christopher Hill
Hugh Reyley
Charles Reyley
John Costelloe
Laghlin Donnelane [?]
Laghlin Reighnolds
Richard Reighnolds
Harry Byrn
Manus O'Donnell
Daniel McSweeny
Comm[ack] O'Neile
James Griffin
Morogh Farrell
James Farrell
Daniel Farrell
Roger Hanly
Thomas Plunckett
John Reiley
Garrott Farrell
Richard Farrell
Cormack McDonoghue
Dermot Hanley
Daniel O'Connor[6]

There is absolutely no room for doubt that the indictment laid against the State tribunals in this document was a perfectly just one, while the avowal of loyalty to the Sovereign Pontiff and the Holy See contained in it was eminently creditable to those who signed it, but some allowance must in fairness be made for the enormous political difficulties with which Charles and Ormond were encompassed.

The documents either epitomized or reproduced in the volume of the "Calendar of State Papers" now before us naturally have in the main reference to the larger national concerns, but there are several which cast interesting light upon the domestic and family interests of the period. We find, for instance, a letter from the Duchess of Ormond to Lord Arlington, dated 4th April, 1666, declining a marriage for her son suggested by His Lordship. The Duchess' orthography was archaic even for the time, but this only serves to make her missive the more interesting. In it she told Arlington:

> The mache you were pleased to propose for my son John I have consulted my Lord in; and find upon the consideration of the depte yet resting upon his fortune, the unsartanties of moneys coming in, out of which the same should be discharged, his rents besides falling and ill paid by reason of the great and general poverty of the kingdom by the present war and inhibition of transporting cattell from hense into England, as they did formerly, forses him out of these considerations rather to decline that advantage, that by your lordship's, my Lord Crofts' and Mr. Cofferer's endeavours with some probability might have taken effect, than add to his engagement so considerable a sum as would be expected, and might reasonably be so, by the young lady's friends.[7]

It will be seen that the Duchess was at once courteous and businesslike in her manner of declining the proposed "mache" for "my son John," but it is at least probable that if that young gentleman's affections had not been otherwise preëngaged the various monetary deficiencies set out would not have loomed so large in his fond mother's letter.

On the 16th of May, 1666, the Lord Lieutenant wrote to Arlington giving him the first inkling of the scheme to which he had become a party for the creation of a schismatical Catholic Church in Ireland. In this communication, partially summarized as it is in the Calendar, he said:

---

[6] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," pp. 62, 63.

[7] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," p. 85.

You have no doubt long since heard of a declaration of loyalty presented to the King in England and signed by many of the Roman Catholic Irish nobility, gentry and clergy. "The copy I now send contains assertions contrary to the doctrine which, having been heretofore reduced to practice here, did the last King and our present Master much mischief. They who have subscribed to it and they who have not have endeavoured to support their opinions by arguments from books, and censures have been made and passed upon it abroad as well as at home. Those who have subscribed, and thereby rendered their retreat into foreign parts very unsafe, are much grieved to find their stay at home as uncomfortable as theirs that have not. . . . They that have not excuse themselves upon the want of liberty to meet and consult of a matter of so much weight. Hereupon some of the complying party have desired I would give them leave to assure the other party that the meeting of about the number of forty would be connived at at Dublin, and that there and in their return thence they should be safe.

"This I have presumed to give my word for upon these grounds:

"First, to satisfy the honest clergy, for so I may call them who would be glad to have so unpleasing a doctrine as theirs is to the Court of Rome fortified by a conjunction as considerable in weight and number as they can get. Next, to be able to distinguish in truth between those who are fit to be connived at, and those who ought to be sent out of the kingdom or the laws let loose upon them in it. And last of all I thought this no unreasonable conjunction either to keep up the division or, by the unanimity of such a declaration, to take away the expectation of a conjunction from any foreign enemy."

The meeting is not to be till the middle of June, and any time before that the King's disapprobation will disappoint it. "Some may be of opinion that the shortest and safest way would be to send them all away or let the severity of the laws fall upon them, but they who are of this opinion either do not know the constitution of this kingdom or do not care what the consequences of such a proceeding would be. However, I am sure at this time it would not be prudent; and even in more settled and peaceable times it may be the subject of very serious consideration how the state shall govern itself towards such members as are of that religion, and how far forth the alteration of laws made almost an age since, and of which we have seen no fruit but rebellion, may be councellable. Few men have ventured to touch upon this point, nor do I determine whether the change of the laws should be to greater severity or lenity; but methinks the unsuccessfulness of them, or of the want of executing them, seems to require something that is not."[8]

It will be observed that Ormond thought that he could count on a sufficiency of "honest clergy" being found ready to break with "the Court of Rome" to enable the establishment of a so-called National Church, under the headship of the dissolute but secretly Catholic King, while he had been forced to the conclusion that the application of the penal laws against the far more manly Catholics of Ireland produced "no fruit but rebellion." It will be interesting to here set out the main influences which had weighed with him in bringing him to these conclusions.

The chief promoter of the religiously traitorous design referred to by the Lord Lieutenant was one Peter Walsh, a priest belonging to the Irish Franciscan Order, who was born at Moortown, in the County Kilkenny, and died in London in 1687. Holding for a time the position of professor of theology in the University of Louvain, he came to Dublin to exercise those capacities for intrigue and fast living which he seems to have possessed in superabundance. Father Peter Talbot, S. J., brother of the Tirconnell and afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, was one of the strongest and most vigorous opponents of Walsh's designs. In one of his denunciations of that personage he accused him of flaunting about Dublin in fine dress, bedizened with ribands, in the manner of the men of fashion of the time, and asserted that "a certain lady inquired of him whether his patron, St. Francis, 'ever wore such cloathes.'" Father Talbot included in his censures of Walsh not only that misguided man, but those other clerics who aided and abetted him in his effort to induce the priesthood of Ireland generally to sign the "Remonstrance," or declaration of loyalty to Charles II., which would have been equivalent to a denial of the authority of the Holy See. If the future Archbishop of Dublin was not entirely misinformed, these were a wild, bad lot. He wrote as follows:

---

[8] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," pp. 107, 108.

> All your suffering to see your spiritual children—the Remonstrants—return home to you with money in your purses, and treat you and your Commissary—Father Redmond Caron—very splendidly at the sign of the Harp and Crown in Dublin, almost every night, with good cheer, dancing and danes, or Irish cronans; especially the famous Maquillemore, which was styled in a letter to Rome: "Cantio barbara et agrestis;" and called by the soldiers of the guard in Dublin—hearing it every night at midnight—Friar Walsh and Friar N. singing of psalms? All your suffering to see your grave Remonstrants dance gigys [jigs] and country dances, to recreate yourself and the Commissary, who was as ready and nimble at it as any of his collectors? But indeed it is said you danct with a better grace than any of the company.[9]

Walsh was living at this time in Kennedy's court, off Nicholas street, in the very heart of the then city of Dublin, within musket shot of the castle and, of course, under the protection of the Viceroy. The Harp and Crown referred to by Father Talbot was a well-known hostlery or inn. It was from Walsh's residence the letters were sent out summoning the National Assembly or Synod of the Irish clergy, which Ormond was so anxious to see meet in the capital and which did actually come together in June, 1666. This convention had absolutely no canonical authority, and all its proceedings were pronounced null and void beforehand by the Papal Nuncio at Brussels as well as by a letter from Cardinal Barberini from Rome. That Father Talbot did not in any degree misjudge Walsh may be inferred from the fact that after the death of the latter in London, in 1687, the Protestant Bishop of Salisbury bore testimony that: "He was the honestest and learnedest man I ever knew amongst them"—the Catholics—"and was, indeed, in all points of controversy almost wholly a Protestant." After this it was only natural for his Anglican eulogist to add: "He was an honest and able man much practiced in intrigue."[10] Such was the character of the man on whom Ormond mainly relied for the carrying through of his scheme for the assembling of a schismatical National Synod.

Walsh, however, had his aiders and abettors amongst the clergy in his schismatical designs, and foremost of these was the Commissary, Father Caron, referred to by Father Talbot in the vigorous denunciation already quoted. The story of the last sad days of this misguided priest has been told by Walsh himself, and resembles in many particulars that of the closing hours of the leader of the English Modernists, the circumstances connected with whose death and burial recently evoked so much controversy in the columns of both the religious and secular press. Caron had been for years a fierce assailant of the principle of Papal authority and had adopted the worst theories of the Gallican schismatics. Walsh has left on record his account of the final hours on earth of his friend, which may or may not be true. In this he says:

---

[9] See Sir John Gilbert's "History of Dublin," Vol. I., p. 194, published 1857.

[10] See Webb's "Compendium of Irish Biography."

> When Caron was on his deathbed, even after he had received the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, and his last viaticum, too, of the Holy Eucharist, when he was every moment expecting his death, without any kind of hopes of recovery, and being in this condition, however, still in his perfect senses, he was told by me and others it had been bruited of him abroad in the city, even amongst lords and ladies, that, being come to this point, he retracted his signature and defense of the Remonstrance, and his whole doctrine or books of that matter. He presently desired me to call into his chamber the whole community of the Franciscan Fathers—who were then next room to him at supper—and as soon as they were all entered, the Commissary General—who a little before came from Spain—Father Mark Brown, heading them, our dying Father Redmund Caron, having first declared the cause of his sending for them at that time to be the foresaid false report; and then his trouble that any religious men should be so unreasonably desirous to advance, or cherish a fiction, as to invent lies of a dying man that was every moment expecting to appear at the tribunal of the Great Judge, to give there an account of both his life and doctrine; in the third place he declared unto them, and desired them all to bear witness of his declaration, that as he was now suddenly to answer God, he both subscribed first the Remonstrance and engaged after in defense of that Formulary and subscription thereof, according to the best and clearest dictates of his inward conscience, without having ever at any time since entertained the least thought of fear, doubt or scruple of any error, sin or unlawfulness, either in doing so or in not retracting what he had so done. And then in the fourth and last place, converting himself to me, and desiring me to sit by him on the bedside, and I accordingly sitting there, he further declared his conscience to be that I was bound in conscience to prosecute still, even after his death, that matter, and continue that defense or advancement of that doctrine which in his lifetime I had for so many years, and notwithstanding so much contradiction, maintained.[11]

For a dying man Father Caron must have possessed a considerable measure of loquacity, but it is necessary to remember that for this version of his deathbed sentiments we have only Walsh as an authority. On the day following the supposed delivery of the allocution quoted Father Caron died, it may be hoped, repenting—if he ever spoke—the words ascribed to him by Walsh. So great was the toleration now displayed by the government towards the Catholics, in the hope that they might all become remonstrants and rejectors of the authority of the Holy See, Father Caron's obsequies were celebrated with the full ritual of the Church, while his funeral sermon was preached by Walsh. After the ceremonies in the church of the Franciscans had concluded his body was borne, attended by a concourse of some two thousand Dublin Catholics, to St. James' graveyard, where it was interred. The whole story is lamentably and terribly similar to that connected with the death of the late Father Tyrrell, who, like Father Caron, died amongst those who were determined to persist in the errors they had embraced partially under his influence.

---

[11] Gilbert's "History of Dublin," Vol. I., pp. 305, 306.

Ormond, naturally enough, was directing all his energies towards securing the success of the so-called National Synod, but he found it necessary to address many reassuring words to London, where some doubts appear to have existed as to whether that assembly, when it met, would prove quite as subservient as he hoped it would. On the 9th of June, 1666, he wrote from Dublin Castle to the Lord Chancellor of England in part as follows:

> A meeting of the Irish clergy will take place here next week, though it has, upon the matter, been prohibited by a letter from Cardinal Barberini and the Internuntio at Brussells as a thing threatening to the Catholic religion. The letters sent from them by a Dominican friar, one Farrell, I took yesterday from the titular Bishop of Ardagh and had copies of them made, which I send. They were not opened by him, and he voluntarily gave them up. "I am still hopeful good use may and will be made of this meeting if the zeal that is almost general here against Popery and Irish will let us make the best of it."[12]

On the 13th of June he wrote again, this time to Lord Arlington, saying:

> "The meeting of the Romish clergy in this place is now complete by the arrival yesterday of their Primate. They will this day receive a message from me in the words you will find in a paper enclosed. I would be very glad they would make an end of their work quickly, for such an assembly and that of such a Parliament as this is may perhaps not agree well together." And here I must again put your lordship in mind how necessary it is that the remaining bills should be hastened to us, least we might, by some accident, be compelled to put an end to the session without passing messages which are useful for the Government and revenue.[13]

The Parliament with which Ormond had to deal and which he was endeavoring to induce to vote taxes to be levied off those whom it represented was mainly composed of the delegates of the Cromwellian and English settlers. In the letter which he addressed to "the meeting of the Romish clergy" the Lord Lieutenant was candid enough to make clear the purposes which animated him in allowing them to assemble. He wrote thus:

> That it is too well known to persons now assembled amongst the Romish clergy in Dublin what attempts have been made upon the Royal authority in this kingdom under colour of pretended authority from the Pope, and how far those attempts prevented many people from returning to their due allegiance to the Crown, or drew away those who had returned to it. This appeared by the violation of the Peace of 1646 and the faith of the then confederate Roman Catholics at the instigation of the Nuntio Rinuccini, and by the proceedings of the titular Bishops at Jamestown in [1650].
>
> That divers of the nobility and gentry of Ireland and of the said clergy in January and February, 1661 [1662], calling to mind the attempts and deplorable consequences thereof to the Crown and to themselves, presented the King with a Remonstrance and Protestation of their loyalty to His Majesty, and their renunciation and detestation of any doctrine or power

---

[12] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669, p. 180.

[13] *Ibid*, p. 181.

> from which those practices might be deduced. To this remonstrance and protestation divers others of the nobility and gentry and most of the clergy resident in the kingdom have not yet subscribed, although more than four years are 'refluxed" since the same was first presented to His Majesty.
>
> The clergy, whose example and encouragement the laity may expect, have delayed their subscriptions on pretense that they want time to consider. This is given them, and it is expected that they will make good use of it for asserting and owning the King's authority and to the advantage of the clergy themselves. No long time need be spent, since the remonstrance, etc., has now been issued for four years and must therefore be understood.[14]

Even now, after nearly two centuries and a half have elapsed, it is impossible to see how any Catholic could have conscientiously signed the Remonstrance. The document was pronouncedly anti-Papal.

The assembly to which Ormond's missive was addressed held their meetings in the house of Father Angel Golding, parish priest of St. Andeon's parish, in St. Andeon's Arch, lying between High street and Cook street, close to the once Catholic Cathedral, Christ Church. Its proceedings appear to have been conducted with suitable propriety and regularity, despite the circumstance that it contained representatives of two factions divided on irreconcilable principles. The meetings, we are told, were "in one room, which manner of sitting they held on all along till they were dissolved; only their committees meeting and sitting in other rooms." The first chairman was Dr. Andrew Lynch, Bishop of Kilfenora, but he was superseded in the presidency by the Primate—the Archbishop of Armagh[15] predecessor of the Blessed Oliver Plunkett, the martyr successor of St. Patrick. On the 15th of June Ormond wrote again to London, saying:

> Though the Romish clergy have been sitting here now in a kind of Convocation for six days, they have not brought themselves to sign the Remonstrance, but "would elude the force of it by the alteration of the words under pretense of ill manners and indecency of naming the Pope."
>
> I shall keep them to the letter of the Remonstrance unless they give the full sense of it in other terms, and even then I shall not admit of the change without authority from the King.
>
> The end I think will be that some will subscribe and others not; and that I think liberty and countenance should be given to those who do subscribe, and the others smartly prosecuted, "till they be driven out of the kingdom, which is a kind of martyrdom some of them aspire to, that, having suffered as they will allege for the Catholic cause, they may be better provided for abroad." I send the substance of "an occasional message." I sent them yesterday, to show them that nothing but complete signature will satisfy.[16]

---

[14] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," pp. 131, 132.

[15] Edward O'Reilly, Archbishop of Armagh, born in Dublin in 1606, and educated chiefly on the Continent. He was Vicar General of Dublin from 1642 to 1648, but through the intrigues of Walsh he was arrested, imprisoned and eventually banished. In April, 1657, he was appointed by the Holy See Archbishop of Armagh, but he was only able to visit his diocese at intervals and secretly. For his strong Catholic attitude during sittings of the Dublin gathering Ormond had him again arrested, transported to and imprisoned in England, and eventually sent into exile. He died at Saumur, France, in 1669, aged sixty-three.

[16] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," p. 134.

The message referred to in this communication was as follows:

> I understand it is reported that I intend in a few days to leave this city, and that it is feared by the Romish clergy now assembled here that they may, consequently, not have time to consider and conclude the business for which their meeting was permitted. This was the subscribing to the Remonstrance and Protestation subscribed and presented to the King in January and February, 1661 [1662] by divers of the nobility, gentry and Romish clergy. I thereupon think it fit to let them know I have no intention of leaving this city so soon; and that they will have time to resolve on the signature of the protestation, which consists of nothing but an acknowledgment of the duty they owe to the King and a condemnation of all doctrine and practice contrary thereto. Such an opportunity has not been given to them or their predecessors, and, if now lost, may not easily be recovered.[17]

It will be readily realized that the purpose of this letter was to intimidate the members of the Catholic convocation who were loyal to the Holy See. Eventually, after a session of nearly a month's duration, it dissolved without approving the Remonstrance—devised by Walsh—which Ormond was so desirous it should endorse.

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND UNDER THE PENAL LAWS.

ALL educated English-speaking Catholics are more or less familiar with the story of the sufferings of our forefathers in England and Ireland during those dark centuries of triumphant heresy that lay between the great apostasy of the sixteenth and the first act of relief passed at the close of the eighteenth century. The unspeakable cruelties of Henry and Elizabeth, the massacres of Cromwell, the horrors permitted even under the Stuart Kings, are written large on the bloodstained pages of English and Irish history. No Englishman worthy of the name fails to reckon amongst the greatest heroes of his country such champions of the faith as Blessed John Cardinal Fisher and Blessed Thomas More, the Carthusian martyrs, the glorious sons of the Society of Jesus, led by Blessed Edmund Campion, the no less splendid band of seminary priests, with Blessed Cuthbert Mayne as their protomartyr, the long list of religious and secular, clergy and laity, men and women who despised torture and death for the sake of the eternal truth—all these are as household words to an English Catholic. And close beside them come the yet larger company that confessed that truth to the enduring of loss of liberty and of goods, and of all that makes the social and civic life of a free man. While of Ireland's soil it might almost be said, as St. Gregory the Great said in effect to the imperial ambassador of the dust of the Coliseum, that its very soil is rich in the relics of the martyrs. No country in Christendom, probably, can boast of such a record of long-borne constancy and loyalty in the face of all that was most terrible to flesh and blood. There is not a Christian in all the world but must do homage with his whole being when he thinks of the story of Ireland's sufferings and Ireland's faith.

---

[17] "Calendar of State Papers (Ireland), 1666-1669," p. 134.

A strange contrast exists between the recognition of England's and Ireland's conflict and victory for the Catholic religion and the comparatively dense ignorance that surrounds the long story of the Scottish Church during those days of darkness. This is partly due to the fact that with scarcely an exception none of those who suffered for the faith between the Cheviots and the Pentland Firth gave up their lives upon the scaffold. Scottish martyrs there were in plenty, but their marytrdom was such as that of the Pontiffs St. John I., St. Silverius and St. Martin I., who, though they did not shed their blood at the bidding of a pagan or a heretical tyrant, are none the less reckoned among the candidates exercitus. The death that surely comes through the deliberate infliction of chains and fetters, hunger and cold, homelessness and exile, if not technically martyrdom, is surely reckoned to share its glory in the Acta Sanctorum of Paradise.

Another reason why the heroism of our Catholic forefathers in Scotland has not impressed itself more deeply on the hearts of the English-speaking faithful is the deliberate and cold-blooded policy of banishment that for nearly two centuries was adopted by the men who had gagged and fettered Scotland and were draining her of her very life-blood. Men and women were sent in their thousands across the sea; their persecutors wished at once to avoid the odium and possible danger of wholesale slaughter, and at the same time to ensure a like result. The very name of Catholic was to be extirpated from Scottish soil. It would be the height of injustice to impute this spirit to Scottish Protestantism as a whole. If it had not been for the warm sympathy and the generous protection afforded by Protestant friends and neighbors the faith would indeed, humanly speaking, have been uprooted from the kingdom. There were thousands who, whatever their own opinions, had no desire but to live in peace with neighbors whom they knew to be God-fearing men, loyal subjects and good citizens. They had no quarrel with a man because he believed and practiced what a few generations before all Scotland had believed and practiced. Some of these sympathizers, no doubt, had themselves a secret leaning towards the ancient faith, while of many more it might be said, to paraphrase somewhat

Charles James Fox's famous words in his speech on one of the Catholic relief bills, that however they might hate Popery, they hated the unchristian fierceness, the blasphemy and scurrility, the fire and sword of the Covenanters infinitely more. But for many decades, whether politically in power or in opposition, it was the spirit of the Covenant that ruled in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs.

A third reason for the obscurity that has for so long brooded over the 233 years of the penal statutes in the northern kingdom has been the comparative scarcity of documentary evidence. Nothing approaching the completeness of the records of the English persecution has been available for Scotland. The northern kingdom was far less in touch with native ecclesiastics abroad; there was no Cardinal Allen or Father Robert Persons to store up and transmit to future generations the sufferings of the Catholic clergy and laity and the brave fight for the truth that was being waged unceasingly in the wild glens and the storm-swept islands of the north. Scottish Catholicity, from a variety of circumstances, was not in evidence like that of England. For many years after the final apostasy under Elizabeth members of the English hierarchy still lingered, bearing witness in their prisons to the religion of St. Augustine and St. Cuthbert, St. Thomas and St. Edmund. Some of them had yielded to Henry's blandishments or threats when the issue was not so clear as it had since become; now there was no shadow of weakness except in one unhappy man—Kitchen of Llandaff—well called by an old writer "the calamity of his see." While there was no apostasy among the Scottish Bishops, there was no such heroic stand for the faith. Only six sees were filled at the time of the change of religion; their occupants remained at large, unlike their brethren in England; they even enjoyed, in part at least, their former incomes, though they were, like all Catholics, technically outlaws under the acts of the pseudo-parliament of 1560. The Primate, Archbishop Hamilton, who, whatever may be said of his career, had shown himself wise and tolerant to a high degree in his dealings with heretics, was judicially murdered at St. Andrews in 1571. Archbishop James Beatoun, nephew of the great and patriotic Cardinal, escaped to France and died in Paris in 1603. With him the ancient hierarchy of Scotland came to an end, to be restored 275 years later by Pope Leo XIII.

From the catastrophe of 1560 until the union of the crowns the state of the country was one of perpetual commotion and of ever-deepening moral degradation. Patriotism seemed almost dead. The Protestant leaders unblushingly sold their country for English gold. The sorrows of Queen Mary, from her arrival in Scotland until the day she was done to death at Fotheringay at the hands of the worthy daughter of Henry Tudor—the rapacity and venal corruption of the Lords of the Congregation—the abominable tyranny of the "reformed" preachers, headed by John Knox, apostate priest and traitor—all these are outstanding facts of history, and the verdict of history grows ever more unmistakable with regard to them. But the sufferings of the thousands who still clung to the ancient faith are only by slow degrees coming to be recognized by their successors of to-day. We owe an immense debt to Father Forbes Leith, S. J., for the devotion, diligence and literary skill with which he has, in a volume published some years ago, brought together original documents hitherto unpublished, that have let a flood of light upon the obscure story of Catholicism in Scotland during those terrible days. And he has now added indefinitely to the debt owed him alike by the historians and the student, by two recently published volumes of "Memoirs of Scottish Catholics During the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," which form a mine which will be assiduously worked by all future writers on this period of Scottish history. No apology is surely needed for bringing a literary contribution of such extreme value before the readers of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY.

By the acts of August 24, 1560—passed by an assembly that had no legal right to the title of Parliament, in consequence of its entire lack of royal warrant and the utter defiance of constitutional methods that characterized it—the jurisdiction of the Supreme Pontiff was abolished in Scotland, all previous acts in favor of the Church were repealed, and the practice of the Catholic religion was prohibited under penalties of forfeiture for the first, banishment for the second and death for the third offense. Broadly speaking, this was the legislation under which Scotland groaned for more than two hundred years. The execution of the laws differed greatly in severity at different periods; the capital penalty was in scarcely any cases exacted, but there was the statute book ever threatening the peace of a considerable proportion of the population of the country, and no man knew from day to day whether his home and property, his family and his personal liberty might not be placed in dire peril. Scottish Catholics seem at times to have complained of a lack of sympathy and help on the part of their brethren in England, more particularly during the later period of the persecution. The hideous cruelties of Elizabeth, that had given the English Church—the true Ecclesia Anglicana—so glorious a roll of martyrs, had no exact parallel in Scotland, but English Catholics do not seem to have realized altogether how their lot in after times became really more tolerable than that of the faithful beyond the Tweed. There is no doubt that in the latter half of the seventeenth and the whole of the eighteenth century this was the case. The political troubles of the time bore more heavily on Scotland than on the sister kingdom, and, bad as the record of Anglicanism is—horrible in the early days of the apostasy—in this later period it compares favorably with the pitiless and senseless hatred of religious liberty exhibited by the dominant party in Scotland. The fact is that while Anglicanism is *au fond* the very quintessence of Protestantism, and Erastian Protestantism at that, there are a number of external conditions, principally connected with social culture and hierarchical tradition, which makes the average Anglican regard the Catholic Church in a totally different way from that in which he looks at Scottish Presbyterianism or English Nonconformity. The present writer remembers many years ago hearing an earnest and devout Anglican, a man of intellectual power and a barrister of high standing, when a fellow Protestant spoke with some condemnation or regret of a recent conversion to the Church, reply: "Not at all—he's only gone back to the old stock." And this represents the feeling of a large number of good Church of England people, and one result of it long ago was that the penal statutes lay less grievously upon the children of the Church in the southern kingdom than in the northern for many years before their repeal.

To turn now to the volumes before us. Father Forbes Leith for the whole of his first and the greater part of his second volume has had abundant material to draw upon in the shape of the letters of the Jesuit Fathers working in Scotland and the annual reports of their work sent by them to the general of the society. These come to an end in 1712, owing probably to the loss of many papers when the order was suppressed in 1773, and "the archives of the society passed into the keeping of its unfriends."[1] Fortunately, however, another source was open to the author. A manuscript, hitherto scarcely known and quite inaccessible to the public, lies among the records of St. Mary's College, Blairs. It has for its title, "Some Account of the State of Religion and of the Mission in Scotland Since the Reformation, Compiled from Letters and Other Original Monuments," by the Rev. John Thompson, who in 1767 was rector of the Seminary at Scanlan. This training-ground for priests intended to serve on the Scottish mission was founded in the very depths of the darkest times, and was the predecessor of Blairs. To both the Church in Scotland is indebted for a long record of high courage, unflinching devotion and the self-sacrifice that counts the cost and rejoices to pay it to the uttermost. It is fitting that this record should be joined to those of the fathers of the Society of Jesus in a single work, since side by side, during those long and weary centuries, secular clergy and Jesuit fathers gave themselves to the cause of God and Scotland. Mr. Thompson's intensely interesting compilation is followed by some "notes and minutes" dealing with the period 1761-1787, written by the Abbé Macpherson, who for many years was agent in Rome for the Scottish clergy, while letters from Bishop Hay and other documents close the story of the penal days and bring the reader to the triumphant and unopposed passage of the Catholic relief bill through both Houses of Parliament in the early summer of 1793. Thus ended the 233 years of outlawry, of vindictive persecution and refined cruelty, which had tried as in a seven-times heated furnace the children of the Church in Scotland, and which must have destroyed beyond hope of resurrection any society that was not quickened by a divine and therefore an undying life.

---

[1] Introduction to Vol. II., p. 5.

The records of those who actually lived during and took an active part in stirring times of history have always a value that cannot attach to any later documents bearing on the same period. It may well be that the contemporary writers are unable to take so wide a view of the whole series of events as those who come after them; just as during the progress of a battle the commander of a battalion is unable to realize what is taking place in every part of the field, while the historian, writing in times of peace, can give a connected picture of the whole conflict. But the historian's work would be of little value but for the witness of those who had lived through and taken part in what he records. In the case of the Scottish Catholics the witness of contemporaries is especially precious, partly because of the obscure conditions, so far as the world at large was concerned, under which the struggle for the faith had to be waged. Scotland was, in those unhappy days, far more remote from the comity of European civilization than she was before or since. The kindly old alliance with France was a thing of the past; the Scotsmen who had experience beyond their own country were for the most part exiles for their faith or their political loyalty, who had perforce to place their service and their valor at the feet of a foreign ruler. The old religion existed, indeed, in Scotland, but it was out of sight, except at the Vatican and the Scots colleges abroad. Europe had almost forgotten that there still was a Catholic remnant beyond the Tweed. The religion established on the ruins of the ancient Church was, in addition to its other disadvantages, profoundly dull and uninteresting. An acute modern writer remarks that since the act reëstablishing Presbyterianism in 1690, "the ecclesiastical history of Scotland ceases to possess general importance and becomes matter only of provincial or parochial interest;"[2] and he might with truth have substituted 1560 for the later date. It is good, therefore, for all historical students to be reminded that behind all the dreary and unlovely strife of Episcopalian and Covenanter, Resolutioner and Remonstrant, Cameronian and Established Presbyterian, Burgher and Anti-burgher, Original Secessionist and Relief Secessionist, there was even at the worst of times a body of brave men and women holding fast to the faith St. Ninian brought to Galloway and St. Columba planted on the lonely shores of Hü—a body which was part of the *Sancta Ecclesia per orbem terrarum,* as much the Holy Catholic Church in the recesses of the Highland glens and on the storm-swept Hebridean isles as beneath the shelter of Rome's glorious basilicas. To the successor of St. Peter the handful of priests and laity, with their vicars apostolic (from 1694 onwards), were children and brethren as dear as the hierarchy and faithful of lands that still were true to the Throne of the Fisherman. In the history of Christendom there is a place of undying honor for the confessors of the penal times. Their position, like that of the Church herself, is the position of a *civitas supra montem posita.* Their story is of the deepest import to their fellow Catholics in every time and every land—while that of their persecutors, apart from the cruelties that bring it into relation with the ancient faith, is a story of the narrowest interest and the most local significance. What does it concern the Universal Church to know the quarrels and the divisions, the loud assertions or denials, the petty politics and administration of a religious society whose very being is limited by the bounds of a single nationality? Except in so far as she can aid and restore the souls that have been separated, almost all simply through their fathers' sins, from her blessed unity, such a society is simply devoid of religious interest. Individuals in it may be of the deepest interest, but the system to which they happen to be attached is of no historical significance in the records of the kingdom that has jurisdiction in all the world, and to whom all nations are but children, whether living in loyal obedience or revolted from their Mother's loving sway.

---

[2] The Church of Scotland, 1070-1560," by R. Morris Stewart, pp. 400, 401.

At the time when the first of Father Forbes Leith's volumes takes up the tale of the struggles of the Scottish Catholics, King Charles I. had but recently come to the united throne of Great Britain. Under his father persecution had been rife, and in 1615 the Venerable Father John Ogilvie, S. J., had died for the faith in Glasgow. But the last years of King James and the first of his successor were a time of quiet; the fact that the new King had married a Catholic Princess and the strong representations on the part of the ambassadors of the Catholic powers seem to have been the reason of this lull in the storm. Besides, though himself probably the only convinced Anglican that ever sat on the English throne, King Charles hated persecution and only consented to it, as he did to the other deplorable incidents of his reign, under compulsion from stronger and much worse men. As early as 1628, however, the storm broke about Christmas time, and for more than two years the most barbarous cruelties were exercised upon the Catholic population. It must be borne in mind that excommunication on the part of the Protestant ministers carried with it civil outlawry. Those who incurred this sham excommunication were turned out of their houses and cast adrift; sickness, old age, infancy, the sorrows of motherhood could plead no exemption. The annual letter to the father general of the Society of Jesus (Vitelleschi) for 1629 states that midwives were even instructed to cause, directly or indirectly, the death or ruin in health of the children they helped to bring into the world and of their mothers. Father Forbes Leith quotes a writer in the Edinburgh *Review* (Vol. xxvi.), who asserts that "the complete extirpation of the Catholic Church, not merely as a public establishment, but as a tolerated sect, was the avowed object of our Scottish Reformers . . . even to massacre the Catholics, man, woman and child." No tenants were allowed to pay their rents to a Catholic landlord, but the amount due was to be paid into the Exchequer. No debts were recoverable by Catholic creditors. The horrible penalty of high treason was incurred by all who were excommunicate, and who either joined in Catholic rites, gave hospitality to a priest or neglected to assist at heretical sermons and to receive the Protestant communion. While there is no evidence that this extreme penalty was ever put into execution, it can easily be imagined, in times of such unrestrained license, that no Catholic could feel secure in life or limb under such legislation.[3]

The brave old Marquis of Huntly, one of the pillars and chief protectors of the Catholic cause and people, was a special mark for the hatred of the Puritans, and by an apparent refinement of cruelty his eldest son, Lord Gordon, whom King James had compelled to be brought up with the Royal Princes as an Anglican, was nominated "commissioner for suppressing Popery in the north" at the close of 1629. It seems clear that Gordon was at heart a convinced Catholic; in any case, he placed his authority in the hands of three "vicars" for the time being, and even when compelled to act used what delay and evasion he could consistently with his own personal and political safety. The result of this outburst, in addition to terrible suffering and heavy loss, was, as Father James Macbreck, S. J., writes to Fr.

---

[3] Almost more brutal than all else, the children of Catholics were torn from their parents and forcibly brought up in heresy. To this abominable practice we owe the apostasy of several of our leading families.

General Vitelleschi in October, 1631, "every day some leave their country and their possessions for their religion."

In the following year, however, the persecution slackened in vehemence, the King setting himself against the cruelties of the Calvinistic party and writing to the Council in Edinburgh that he recognized the Catholics as his faithful subjects and desired that they should be left in peace. On June 18, 1633, Charles was crowned King of Scotland in the church of Holyrood, and Father James Leslie gives a long account of the ceremonial used on the occasion—the Protestant rite, then as now, differing but little from the mediæval. The King's determination to introduce a somewhat modified Anglicanism into Scotland, as to rites as well as government, set the two Protestant parties at each other's throats, and this domestic strife gave a breathing space to the Catholics, who increased greatly in numbers at this time. But the troubles of the "White King" soon gathered around him. The Puritan element in England and Scotland alike, though by no means in sympathy with the majority of the people, was, as ever, noisy, violent, cruel and intolerant and succeeded in overturning all government in the State, as it had in the previous century grown to power on the ruins of the Church. Within a very few years of the Edinburgh coronation the south of Scotland was largely in the hands of the rebel Covenanters —a party which, whatever the mistaken zeal and sincerity of some of its members, was simply the outward expression of all that was most narrow, tyrannical and intolerant in the kingdom. The tyranny of autocracy is mild beside the tyranny of political nonconformity! The liberty claimed by Puritans is the liberty to extinguish all freedom but their own.

The dismal story of the sufferings of Catholics at the hands of these fanatics is brightened by the record of new gains to the Church, which included a prominent doctor of Aberdeen University, and by the brilliant story of the campaigns of the gallant Marquis of Montrose, who though himself a Protestant, had the greatest respect for the ancient faith and welcomed Catholics to his standard on account of their proved loyalty. In spite of all they had suffered, they were loyal to the Royal House and the settled government of the country. The Puritans turned rebels as soon as the proceedings of either did not please them. Time after time history has proved in this way who are the citizens upon whom a government or a country may rely. The most enlightened nations all recognize the fact. A great republic like the United States, or a monarchy with immense personal powers such as Germany, are alike in this. To declare war, as France has done, on the Catholic Church, is to proclaim national decadence and governmental imbecility.

The troubles that led to the tragedy of Whitehall and the protectorate naturally bore with special hardness on Catholics, though Anglican Protestants were now their fellow-sufferers. At the beginning of 1644 so severe was the persecution that Father Macbreck could write to father general that he was the only member of the society who had managed to remain in Scotland. With Montrose's army, however, there was more than toleration. A number of clergy accompanied the Scottish and Irish Catholic troops, Mass was openly celebrated and the consolations of the sacraments afforded to the soldiers, whose piety seems to have been genuine and fervent. The disastrous defeat and massacre of Philiphaugh at length sealed the fate both of Montrose and of the King's cause in Scotland, while the cold-blood atrocities committed at the instigation of the Puritan ministers stained their party with deep and indelible infamy.

One of the most memorable confessors for the faith at this time was Father Andrew Leslie, S. J., who after sixteen years of devoted worth and much danger and suffering on the Scottish mission was seized at Inverness in May, 1647, and imprisoned in Aberdeen jail for over a year. He trusted that the crown of martyrdom awaited him, and the intention of his persecutors seems unquestionably to have been to murder him by starvation and disease. He was eventually released and banished, made his way to the Scots college at Douay in much suffering, and then to Rome, where he became rector of the Scots college. In 1652 he returned to Scotland—so a later hand states on the MS. in which he describes his sufferings with the simplicity and modesty of a true saint; but to our deep regret no information exists, so far as is known, of when or how so noble a life came to a close.

On May 29, 1660, the King came to his own again. Charles II. is a man who has been probably much misjudged both by his contemporaries and later critics. There seems no doubt that the Merry Monarch was at heart a Catholic during the whole of his reign, though he was only reconciled by Father Huddlestone on his death-bed. The roystering merriment (to call it by no worse a name) in which he seemed to delight covered a fervent desire to bring back his country to the obedience of the faith and a firm determination to effect this, if it were compatible with the keeping of his throne. Under happier circumstances Charles would have left behind him, probably, the name of a religious, wise and strong monarch. He certainly desired to extend toleration to his Catholic subjects in recognition of their splendid loyalty to his father and himself; but the anti-Catholic spirit, both Anglican and Puritan, was too strong. Yet in spite of parliamentary enactments, the state of Catholics in both Scotland and England greatly improved during the first years of the new reign. The number of converts was wonderful, and their fervor recalled that of the early days of the faith. They had much to suffer at the hands of relations as well as ministers and magistrates. A touching story is told of a girl of good family whom Divine grace brought to the Church. Her Puritan father (no doubt merely a type of his class) twice flogged her pitilessly in the presence of the assembled and horrified household, in spite of the remonstrances of her mother and brother. He then imprisoned her in a "secret chamber," and for two years tried to break her constancy by various forms of suffering. At length his heart was touched. Her parents, filled with respect for her courage and truthfulness, gave her even an added share of their affection as well as of their property, and she had the happiness of becoming the wife of an excellent man, son of a Catholic nobleman, who was attracted to her in the first instance by her heroic virtue. This brave girl was but one of many, of every age and both sexes, who rejoiced to be counted worthy to suffer for the name of the Divine Master.[4] No wonder that the Church at this time grew in numbers as well as sanctity, and that the holiness of many of her children was attested, as various letters bear witness, by miraculous favors. No wonder, too, that the malice of her enemies was aroused to greater efforts of cruelty.

In 1670, to the astonishment of many and the indignation of all the better Protestants, the Privy Council issued an order to the effect that all the penal laws against Catholics should be put into immediate execution. The occasion and pretended justification of this barbarity was the refusal of a young Catholic nobleman to remove his hat, when requested to do so by the Calvinistic ministers, during the burning of "certain witches" at Aberdeen—one of the numerous atrocities of this kind committed during the seventeenth century, both in England and Scotland, by the men of the "reformed" religion. The young man's act "was denounced as a mark of public contempt for the Protestant religion on the part of all the Catholics of the kingdom." During the remainder of the King's reign persecution continued in greater or less degree, while the infamous lies of Titus Oates brought renewed suffering to the Catholics, a traitor's death to some, both priests and laymen, and imprisonment on suspicion to two thousand persons. This appalling instance of how a government and the majority of a whole nation can be deceived by the preposterous fictions of an unredeemed scoundrel belongs, however, to English history and only indirectly affected Scotland.

---

[4] The Jesuit Fathers, it should be remarked, exercise an extraordinary, but no doubt necessary, caution in their letters with respect to the use of names, so that we are left in ignorance, in almost every case, as to the individuality of those of whose heroism we read. "Sunt quorum non est memoria;" yet "filü eorum propter illos in œternum manent: semen eorum et gloria eorum non derelinquetur."

It is impossible to study the short reign of King James II. and VII. without the sad reflection being incessantly forced on the student that here was the grandest opportunity lost, through no evil intention or lack of many of the qualities that make a good ruler, by a really devout and able man. We are compelled to conclude with Father Forbes Leith that James seemed "incapable of understanding difficulties." If the King had followed the counsel of Rome, and imitated that "mora" which is so characteristic of the wisdom of the Eternal City, the history of Great Britain might have been a brighter and less blood-stained record. Yet there was much to excuse any man in his position. He had grown up with the Stuart convictions as to the extent of the royal prerogative; he had been welcomed enthusiastically by the nation on his accession, and the Catholic cause was still strong in the country. When the Papal Legate came to court, his cross borne before; when a Vicar Apostolic was consecrated in the banqueting hall of Whitehall, and when the Holy Sacrifice was again offered in public, it must have seemed to the long-suffering Catholics as if their time of struggle was at an end, and the "second spring" was about to dawn for England and Scotland a century and a half before it actually came. Besides, the King's declaration ensured liberty of conscience for all his subjects, and he might well expect that a common boon would meet with common gratitude. But the Puritan spirit is implacable; it is never content with freedom for itself so long as other people have freedom also. Liberty of conscience is its supreme abhorrence; better rebellion, torrents of blood and unspeakable suffering for the innocent than that other men should worship God according to their convictions. Happily Protestants have long ago declined to be dominated by this spirit of ignorant hatred, and it would be utterly untrue and unfair to imagine that even in the darkest times there were not thousands of non-Catholics who refused to become its slaves.

The Revolution of 1688 brought renewed persecution. William of Orange, himself a man totally devoid of personal religion, so far as appears, had to pose as the Protestant champion and to yield to the clamors of the noisiest and most insistent of those who had helped to place him on King James' throne. This period was, however, marked by the definite organization of the Scottish mission, the Rev. Thomas Nicholson being in 1694 nominated by Innocent XII. Bishop of Peristachium *in partibus infidelium* and Vicar Apostolic in Scotland. For 184 years, until the restoration of the hierarchy in 1878 by Leo XIII., the Scottish Catholics were thus governed. Bishop Nicholson was consecrated on February 27, 1695, and for more than eleven years bore single-handed his apostolic burden, until the appointment of Mr. James Gordon as coadjutor in 1706. The heroism, sufferings and labors, not only of these earliest Scottish vicars of the Holy See, but of their successors, adorn some of the brightest pages of the history of the Church militant. The missionary journeys among the almost pathless mountains and to the farthest outlying islands were experiences that, in those times and under such conditions, demanded the courage of a confessor.

The penal times dragged on their weary length. Under Queen Anne (who granted toleration to Scottish Anglicans) and the first two Georges one anti-Catholic bill after another was passed by the United Parliament, and there was at frequent intervals a recrudescence of active persecution. Mr. Thompson testifies that as late as 1710 "the ministers formed a design to extirpate Catholics and the Catholic religion out of Scotland by sheer force," and ascribes to this intention the foundation of the Scottish "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." The temper of government was, however, becoming milder, and Mr. Carnegie, one of the Scottish clergy, was sent to London on behalf of his Catholic fellow-countrymen. He was successful in gaining the support of the Duke of Queensberry and Lord Dartmouth, Secretary of State for England, and orders were sent forbidding any Catholic to be molested on religious grounds. The risings of 1715 and 1745 for the restoration of the exiled King brought new and grievous trouble. Many Catholics had, naturally, espoused the cause of James III. and VIII., but the Church was not in the least degree committed as such to the support of any particular dynasty. The political question, however, was an excellent pretext for fresh cruelties, and once more the Catholics found fellow-sufferers in the proscribed and cruelly oppressed Anglicans. With the reign of George III., however, a better state of things began to dawn. There were still instances of disgraceful intolerance, but government was determined to clip the wings of the persecutors.

Relief was at hand, but there were still some hard battles to be fought. And, apart from all definite acts of persecution, there was in these later decades of the eighteenth century a sense of exhaustion and a kind of hopeless content so long as there was no active appeal to the penal statutes on the enemy's part. "There were no signs of the times from which any could have gleaned that the season of hope was at hand."[5] A more subtle form of cruelty than that of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had for several generations worn down the spirit of the Catholics of Great Britain. What a recent French novelist says of the plan of action pursued by the anti-religious French Government to-day is true, almost word for word, of the treatment meted out to English and Scottish Catholics in the later times of their outlawry from the national life. "The state of things was just enough to damp their energies instead of rousing them. This was exactly the aim of those who had organized this persecution, in which the weapons were fines and summonses. The persecutors calculated on the depressing effects of a daily struggle against petty worries and attacks, limits to thought and action, discomfort, poverty leading to starvation, and at least inevitable shrinkage. They profited by their ancestors' experiences. . . . They knew that martyrs are very troublesome folk to get rid of, and that when once the axe has been set going, it has a queer knack of cutting off the judges' heads after the victims."[6]

---

[5] Dr. Burton's "Liife and Times of Bishop Challoner," Vol. II., p. 180.

To trace the various steps that finally led to the initial measure of relief for Scotland would require a separate article. But there is one name that stands out in the history of the last years of the penal laws and the first of the new state of things which can never be mentioned without deepest reverence and admiration, and which cannot be omitted when those years are in question—the name of George Hay, the Edinburgh physician, born in 1729, of Protestant parents, a loyal follower of Prince Charlie (on which account he suffered imprisonment in London), received into the Church on his return to Scotland in 1748 by Father John Seton, S. J., ordained at Rome on Holy Saturday, 1758, and on Trinity Sunday, 1769, consecrated, at Scanlan, Bishop of Daulis *in partibus infidelium* and Vicar Apostolic of the Lowland District. One of the greatest of the vicars of the Holy See in Scotland, that country owes him to the most illustrious of the English vicars; for it was the influence of Bishop Challoner that led George Hay first to turn his thoughts to the priesthood. It was Bishop Hay's wisdom, patience and untiring devotion to the cause that was the chief factor in the passing of the Scottish relief act of 1793. The corresponding act for England had become law fifteen years earlier,[7] and but for a strange jealousy of episcopal coöperation on the part of the English committee, it seems certain that Scotland would have been included in that measure. That opportunity once passed, riots in Edinburgh and Glasgow in the following year and the Gordon riots in London in 1780 delayed for long the first measure of justice. Sydney Smith might well write some years later: "If ever a nation exhibited symptoms of downright madness or utter stupidity, we conceive these symptoms may be easily recognized in the conduct of this country upon the Catholic question."[8] The leaders of both political parties, however, were happily not obsessed like so many of their fellow-countrymen. The Anglican Bishops had the wisdom not to oppose a measure of toleration; indeed, the name of Bishop Horsley, of St. David's, deserves to be ever gratefully remembered by Catholics for his generous and large-hearted assistance in the work of emancipation. In Scotland there were leading Presbyterians who no less earnestly helped in the good work. Principal Campbell, of Aberdeen, who several years before had preached against the Catholics, now appeared as their champion in an able pamphlet. A sermon to the same effect was preached before the Aberdeen Synod, and the magistrates of the "Granite City" joined in the determination to allow no such anti-Catholic tumults within their jurisdiction as had disgraced Edinburgh and Glasgow. Principal Robertson, head of the University of Edinburgh, the learned and illustrious historian of his own country and of Charles V., was warm in his support of toleration, and in the *Scots Magazine* for 1779 he describes how the Protestant agitators had treated him: "My character as a man, as a citizen and as a minister of the Gospel has been delineated in the most odious colors. I have been represented as a pensioner of the Pope, as an agent for Rome, as the tool of a King and a Ministry bent on overturning the Protestant religion. In pamphlets, in newspapers and handbills I have been held out to an enraged mob as the victim who deserved to be next sacrificed, after they had satiated their vengeance on a Popish Bishop. My family has been disquieted; my house has been attacked; I have been threatened with pistols and daggers; I have been warned that I was watched in my going out and coming home; the time has been set beyond which I was not to live, and for several weeks hardly a day passed on which I did not receive incendiary letters."

---

[6] "For My Name's Sake." Translated from the French of Champot's "Soeur Alexandrine" by L. M. Legget, p. 124.

[7] A further and much more extensive Relief Act had also been passed for England in 1791.

All that was best in the kingdom was thus united on the question, and thus on June 3, 1793, the royal assent was affixed to the Scottish relief act, and henceforward Catholics were free to follow their consciences without let or hindrance; their lives, persons and property were alike secure. Thirty-six years, however, had still to run before they were to take their place on a footing of absolute equality with their fellows as members of the body politic. And the full measure of justice is still lacking. While any restrictions remain on the statute book that hinder the Sovereign, the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from sharing the liberty of the humblest subject in matters of religious faith and practice, Scottish and English Catholics have still cause to complain that entire freedom is yet to win. We may have to wait long for it, but come it will some day. Puritan ignorance, prejudice and intolerance are not immortal.

---

[8] *Edinburgh Review*, 1807.

Such memoirs as those which Father Forbes Leith's scholarship and historical insight have now given to the world—in such English that the rendering of the Latin documents reads like an original record—should enlighten for all time the obscurity that has too long surrounded the history of the Church in Scotland during her days of suffering. To what glorious effect the Bishops, priests and laity of those times endured and held fast the truth in the face of unspeakable wrong and when to human sight all seemed hopeless, the present state of Scottish Catholics bears witness. Men are still living who have spoken with those who remembered the pressure of the penal statutes. Even half a century ago the spirit of Puritanism prevailed sufficiently to make Scottish Catholics a body more or less isolated, even in secular concerns, from the mass of their fellow-countrymen. Now every day sees the mists of ignorance and hatred dispersing beneath the restored beams of truth and charity. When the relief bill of 1793 became law Catholics in Scotland numbered perhaps 30,000; at the time of the emancipation of 1829, about 70,000; to-day, some 520,000. The immigration from Ireland has no doubt much to do with this immense increase, but is by no means the only factor in the result. We hear almost daily of conversions among the Scottish people. The numerous religious houses scattered all over the country are so many centres of new life and progress, and it was only in 1835 that the first of these—the Ursuline Convent of St. Margaret's, Edinburgh—was opened through the zeal of Mr., afterwards Bishop, Gillis; and the splendid, strong faith of the Highland Catholics, that never wavered in the worst fires of suffering, is bearing fruit worthy of itself to-day.

Outside the Catholic Church there is a no less remarkable change of feeling. As across the border, though in a less marked degree, Scottish Anglicans are steadily approximating in both belief and ceremonial to the Church of which they would fain believe themselves to be a part. There are but few "advanced" churches, as advancement is reckoned say in London or Brighton; but that there is a steady movement in the Catholic direction is shown by the number of conversions from the Anglican body. The Established Presbyterian Church has developed to an extraordinary degree in the same direction. A Presbyterian minister some years ago remarked to the writer that what his Church needed so grievously was restored devotion to the Mother of God! A business man belonging to the United Presbyterian body has told the writer that he rejoiced to see the country turning back towards the old faith, "because," he said, "it's the only religion that can reach the masses." No doubt a great deal of lately introduced ceremonial in the Established Church is æsthetic, not doctrinal, in its origin, but the minds and eyes of Presbyterians are being constantly trained for something more definite in the future. And besides all this, there is a steadily growing current of increased sympathy and large-hearted mutual respect between Catholics and their separated friends. The spirit of the so-called "reformation"—the spirit of deliberate heresy and schism—is by no means dead, but it is stricken mortally. There is a desire for a better understanding and a sense that separation cannot be a permanent ideal. Good feeling between Catholics and Protestants is almost universal. There is, indeed, a knot of survivals from the Covenanters' days and imbued with their spirt. There are a few men who go about spreading the grossest calumnies and striving to stir up strife and hatred, and who naturally attract to their party hooligans of no religion, but who delight in a row of whatever kind. Catholics can afford to smile at these gentry, so far as they really do any harm to the Church; but they are the shame of their own co-religionists. Protestants of good will, of honor, truth and decency are revolted by their lies and their campaign of abuse and slander, and their influence on the thinking people of Scotland is practically *nil*. If it were not that they have command of a well-filled treasury in the shape of a "trust" left for the propagation of Protestantism by such methods, the whole campaign would collapse. In the meantime it is useful as drawing attention to the Catholic religion, and by the very vileness of the means employed inclining thoughtful men in the direction of the faith.

The night has indeed been full of heaviness and the dawn slow and chequered by many clouds of disappointment. But the day has come, though it is far as yet from the fullness of the sunshine.

J. Faber-Schofield.

Eskbank, Midlothian.

THE PARABLE OF "THE LABORERS IN THE VINEYARD."

OF this parable Archbishop Trench remarks that it stands only second to that of the unjust steward in the number of explanations which have been proposed for it, and that it is hardly less—if, indeed, it is less—difficult than that parable.

27. Then Peter answering, said to him: Behold we have left all things, and have followed thee: what therefore shall we have?
28. And Jesus said to them: Amen I say to you, that you, who have followed me, in the regeneration, when the son of man shall sit on the seat of his majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats judging the twelve tribes of Israel.
29. And every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name's sake shall receive an hundred fold, and shall possess life everlasting.
30. But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first.
St. Matthew xix., 27-30.

1. The kingdom of heaven is like to an householder, who went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard.
2. And having agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard.
3. And going out about the third hour, he saw others standing in the market-place idle.
4. And he said to them: Go you also into my vineyard, and I will give you what shall be just.
5. And they went their way. And again he went out about the sixth and the ninth hour, and did in like manner.
6. But about the eleventh hour he went out and found others standing, and he saith to them: Why stand you here all the day idle?
7. They say to him: Because no man hath hired us. He saith to them: Go ye also into my vineyard.
8. And when evening was come, the lord of the vineyard saith to his steward: Call the laborers and pay them their hire, beginning from the last even to the first.
9. When therefore they were come that came about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny.
10. But when the first also came, they thought that they should receive more; and they also received every man a penny.
11. And receiving *it* they murmured against the master of the house,
12. Saying: These last have worked *but* one hour, and thou hast made them equal to us, that have borne the burden of the day and the heats.
13. But he answering said to one of them: Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst thou not agree with me for a penny?
14. Take what is thine, and go thy way: I will also give to this last even as to thee.
15. Or, is it not lawful for me to do what I will? Is thy eye evil because I am good?
16. So shall the last be first, and first last. For many are called, but few chosen.
St. Matthew xx., 1-16.

All manner of answers have been proposed to the radical question, What is the primary lesson of the parable? Some would see the main lesson in the fact that all received the same reward; others insist that we are taught that God rewards not so much the length of service as the intensity of it; others, again, single out the different hours at which the various bands were called to work as being the principal lesson, while many of the fathers seem to see the rejection of the Jews as taught in this parable. Trench points out the weak spot in all these views and himself suggests the view which we fancy claims the suffrages of most expositors—namely, that the parable is directed against a wrong temper and spirit of mind as betrayed in St. Peter's question, "We have left all things and have followed Thee; what therefore shall we have?"

With this conclusion we agree, but Trench arrives at it rather by a process of elimination than by the application of exegetical principles. Let us see, then, whether by the application of sound principles of exegesis we can determine the precise meaning and scope of this parable.

It will, perhaps, help us to arrive at a conclusion if we examine two commentaries on this parable which are to be found among the works of St. Chrysostom.

In the Benedictine edition of St. Chrysostom we find two sets of homilies on St. Matthew. The one contains fifty-four homilies and is commonly known as the "Opus Imperfectum." It is not really in homiletic form, but proceeds from chapter to chapter like any commentary. Neither is it the work of St. Chrysostom, hence its author is generally referred to as Pseudo-Chrysostom. The second collection of homilies is the genuine work of the saint. It covers the whole Gospel, and is made up of ninety-one homilies which form a continuous commentary. It will be of interest to compare the exposition of the parable before us as presented in these two collections.

In the "Opus Imperfectum" Hom. xxxiii. deals with St. Matthew xix., and concludes with an examination of the words, "But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." On this Pseudo-Chrysostom remarks that by the "first" is represented the synagogue—first called, but languishing. Then comes the Church, rising superior, by faith, to this languor; and then the synagogue, seeing the Church thus made the Daughter of God, comes in her turn to Christ.

Homily xxxiv. opens with the parable in question. There is no word of introduction nor of indication that its explanation is to be sought in St. Peter's previous question. The "hours" at which the laborers are summoned represent the calling of Adam, Noe, Abraham, etc. It is well pointed out that only those called at the eleventh hour say, "No man hath hired us." This, says the author, is because the Jews, who are represented by those called at the earlier hours, could not have said it with truth, whereas the Gentiles, called at the eleventh hour, could truly say that they had had no preachers. On the words "beginning from the last even to the first" we are told that since the "first"—viz., the Jews—had become holy by "works," whereas the Gentiles had become so by "grace," and since, too, we are more inclined to make presents than to pay our debts, the "householder" began with the Gentiles, to whom he had no obligations. With true insight the author remarks on these "murmurers" that they grumbled not so much as though they felt themselves defrauded, but rather because they disliked seeing the last-comers get more than they had strictly earned. He then comes to the corollary which Our Lord appends to the parable: "So shall the last be first and the first last," and here he remarks on the fact that the parable had been set forth in order to explain these same words, which stand at the end of the previous chapter; but he does not note the fact that the order is now inverted to fit the parable. Neither does he appear to realize the difficulties in the parable and its corollary. He does see, however, that whereas the parable set forth an absolute equality of rewards the corollary indicated the very reverse, for he says: "He called the last first and the first last, not as signifying that the last were better than the first, but merely that they were made equal to them." This is, indeed, the teaching of the parable, but it can hardly be extracted from the words "the first shall be last," etc. At the same time Pseudo-Chrysostom endeavors to meet this difficulty by referring to a remarkable passage in IV. Esdras v., 41-42, where God is represented as saying, "Coronae assimilabor judicium Meum, sicut non novissimorum tarditas, sic nec priorum velocitas." No part of a crown or circle, remarks Pseudo-Chrysostom, can be said to be before another.

Finally, on the concluding words of the corollary, "For many are called, but few are chosen," he says: "This does not refer to the Jews, but to the Gentiles"—a conclusion which certainly seems as uncalled for as it is unexpected!

S. Chroysostom, Hom. lxv., in Matthew xx. No one familiar with the exegetical style of St. Chrysostom could have possibly taken the foregoing homily for a genuine work of that saint, but when we turn to Homily lxv. in Matthew, which is among the undoubted works of St. Chrysostom, we feel at once that we are in the hands of a master. He begins with the question proposed by St. Peter in the previous chapter: "Behold we have left all things, and have followed Thee; what therefore shall we have?" For St. Chrysostom, as indeed for all commentators, this question is the key to the whole of what follows. But St. Chrysostom feels obliged to absolve St. Peter from any taint of ambition. He makes him say: "Not from any ambition or vain glory do I say this, but I speak in the person of the poor, lest any of them should think that because they have not much to offer they cannot arrive at the height of perfection." After dwelling on the promise made to the disciples that they should be His assessors in the judgment, and on that made to all who should imitate them in their self-renouncement—viz., that they should receive a hundredfold in this life and in the world to come life everlasting—the saint says: "And then immediately our Saviour added: 'But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first.' This He said indiscriminately of the many as well as of the unbelieving Pharisees. He then proposes a parable whereby He kindles the enthusiasm of those who are late-comers." St. Chrysostom gives the parable in full and at once proceeds to point out the difficulties it involves. He does this with startling insistence and in a way which makes us wonder what kind of an audience he had; for he does not hesitate to put before them difficulties in the Gospel narrative which we nowadays would be chary of forcing upon people's attention.

And first of all he asks how the parable can be said to agree with the corollary, "So shall the first be last, and the last first?" For the parable insists on equality of rewards, whereas the corollary is clearly indicative of a remarkable inequality. Again, if the different "hours" at which the laborers are called are to be taken as signifying the different ages of the world in which men were called to the service of God and were approved for their service, how can we conceive of those first called, and presumably now in the possession of the kingdom, breaking out into murmurings?

It is most interesting, from the exegetical point of view, to see how St. Chrysostom solves these difficulties. He begins with the second, how, namely, the saints could murmur. After dwelling at great length on the difficulty and presenting it in various ways, he solves it by saying: "He called it a *parable,* and in parables we must not torture ourselves about the force of every single word. We must find out what is meant by any particular parable, and when we have made our profit out of that, we have no need to make further anxious inquiries. Why, then, was this parable set forth and what was His precise purpose in telling us this (about the murmuring)? He wished to kindle the enthusiasm of those who were advanced in years, and to show them that they must not think that they would therefore have a less reward. Hence he introduces into His story some who cavil at the blessedness of these latter, and this—not to show that they who cavilled were filled with envy—but to show how great a reward was offered even to those advanced in years, since it could become a subject of envious murmurings."

This is bold exegesis. Trench rejects it as "untenable," though he nowhere states his reasons for so doing. We shall return to it at a later period.

St. Chrysostom then asks what precise teaching is intended by the parable. He answers that Our Lord hints that all emanates from His mercy, and that for this reason those who come at the last hour shall not fail, but shall receive an unspeakable reward. And this leads him to the first difficulty he had proposed—viz., how does the parable agree with the corollary to it? The parable teaches apparently that all will be equal; the corollary—"so shall the last be first," etc.—seems to teach the very opposite. St. Chrysostom acutely notes that these words are not really the conclusion of the parable, but, as we have been careful to term them, a species of corollary. "Our Lord," he says, "does not draw this conclusion from the parable, but shows that just as it came to pass (in the parable) that, contrary to expectation, all received the same reward, so will come to pass what is far more remarkable—namely, that the last shall be first and the first last. The parable is one thing, this (the corollary) is another."

St. Chrysostom concludes by saying that the final words, "For many are called, but few chosen," are to be referred to the Jews and to some of the faithful who first shone with virtue and then relapsed, whereas others turned away from their iniquities and became conspicuous for their virtue.

. . . .

These commentaries undoubtedly contain many beautiful things, but from the exegetical standpoint they cannot be considered absolutely satisfactory. In judging of their value it should not be forgotten that they are always homilies—*i. e.*, sermons preached to the people. But the preacher's duty is to make such moral applications of the parables as shall tend to the spiritual formation of their hearers, as St. Chrysostom himself says in this very homily: "Christ rarely discussed dogmatic questions; on the contrary, He was always occupied in teaching us how to live well." Hence St. Chrysostom and the fathers in general were, as preachers, only concerned with the literal sense of the Scripture in so far as it was necessary to grasp it if we would derive from it any spiritual profit. And the charm of St. Chrysostom's expositions lies in this—that, even in these homilies, he does so insist on the literal sense, but he never discusses it for its own sake when he is treating of the Gospels; the moment he has, so to speak, cleared the ground he develops the moral application. But when we turn to his homilies upon the Epistles we find him driven to be very exact in determining the precise literal sense, because he finds it otherwise well nigh impossible to decide what St. Paul's teaching is. The sense of Scripture is, as we know, that which is conveyed by *the words and the things or persons*. From the former we derive the literal sense; from the latter, the mystical or spiritual sense. But the latter is essentially founded on the former, and though we can give moral applications to detached portions of Scripture, yet it cannot be said that these applications are really the spiritual sense of Scripture; they are rather accommodated senses. They can only be termed the "mystical" sense when they are derived, not from the literal sense of an individual verse, but from that of the whole passage. And it seems to us that in the case of the "murmurers" in the parable under discussion we have a very notable instance of the difficulties into which expositors fall through neglect of this truth. It was all very well to interpret those who were called at different hours as representing the Patriarchs, etc., but commentators who did so necessarily found themselves in difficulties when they came to explain how it was that the Patriarchs broke out into complaints anent the admission of the Gentiles to an equal degree of glory with themselves. We have seen above how deeply St. Chrysostom felt this difficulty, and we have seen also the somewhat violent mode of escape he proposed. We must not be understood as opposed to such moral applications; they are the life of our souls and are the means by which we apply the Gospel teaching to ourselves, but we feel that such applications are not justified unless they are in accord with the *entirety* of the letter throughout any given section. It is true that in some parables —*e. g.*, that of the good Samaritan—the mystical sense is clear throughout, and we can, as it were, trace the figure of the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of our souls in every detail; but it is not so in all the parables. Nor must we suppose that because the mystical sense is not clear, it is therefore absent; nor that we are not to endeavor to find a mystical signification except where it leaps to the eyes. Far from it. All we insist on is that the more careful we are in determining the precise literal signification of any passage, the more clearly will the true mystical sense appear and the more solidly will it be founded.

To return, then, to the expositions given above, whether from Pseudo-Chrysostom or from St. Chrysostom himself, there are in them many points on which we feel that the exegete will not be satisfied. Thus St. Chrysostom has well pointed out that the key to the parable is St. Peter's question, "Ecce nos reliquimus omnia." But how many will be satisfied with his explanation of that question? Again, his treatment of the "murmurers" is masterly. No one can object to his view regarding the function of parables, but one cannot help feeling that if he had applied the same treatment to the remainder of the parable certain pitfalls would have been avoided. Thus if he sees in the different "hours" at which the laborers were called an allusion to the Patriarchs, he has no right to regard those same Patriarchs as merely brought upon the stage to emphasize a point. If they were really intended by the laborers, they must have been equally really intended when they were spoken of as "murmuring." Further, St. Chrysostom nowhere develops the point that the word, 'But many that are first shall be last, and the last first," serve both as the introduction to the parable and also as the corollary to it. Neither does he seem to notice that the order is inverted in the corollary where we have, "So shall the last be first, and the first last."

Let us, then, examine the context of the parable in question and see whether a clear and connected statement of it may not enable us to arrive at a clearer idea of the teaching involved both in the parable itself and in the words, "But many that are first shall be last, and the last first." In chapter xix. begins what we may conveniently term "the Peraean preaching." It opens with the question of the Pharisees about divorce. Little children are then brought to Our Lord, after which the rich young man comes forward, and, being told that he must sell all that he has, departs sorrowful, whereupon Our Lord dwells upon the difficulty the rich shall experience in attaining to the kingdom of heaven. This leads up to Peter's question: "Behold *we have* left all things and have followed Thee; what therefore shall we have?" St. Chrysostom, as we have seen, rightly saw that this question motived the parable, but he does not explain *how* it did so, and this, we fancy, is because of the strained interpretation he puts upon St. Peter's question, as given above. But St. Peter was not then a saint; he was a fisherman brought up in a narrow sphere and with all the prejudices of a Galilean. It is true that he had already made his confession of faith (xvi., 13-19), but that he was by no means fully illumined regarding "the kingdom" is clear both from the rebuke he immediately drew down upon himself—"Thou savorest not the things that are of God"—and from his subsequent fall. Hence it seems impossible to exonerate him from a certain amount of undue elation at the thought that he *had* left all. We have, then, to distinguish his question from the underlying spirit which prompted it, and only in this way can we do justice to the whole of Our Lord's answer. We say "the *whole* of Our Lord's answer," because in it there are several parts. The first part is contained in the words: "Amen I say to you, that you, who have followed Me, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the seat of His majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This is the special reward of the Apostles. There then follows the promise to all who should later follow in their footsteps: "And every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands, for My Name's sake shall receive an hundredfold, and shall possess life everlasting."

So far Our Lord has answered the question, "What shall we have?" He now adds a solemn warning: "But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." In these words He states a fact. In the parable which immediately follows He illustrates this statement, as is evident from the repetition, after the parable, of the same words introduced by "so;" but the order is inverted—*i. e.,* He now says: "Thus shall the last be first and the first last"—and the rider is added: "For many are called, but few chosen."

As St. Chrysostom has so well pointed out, the parable is essentially a parable, and only holds good for the argument directly deducible from it. All other interpretations are accidental to it, though they are possible as long as they do not go against the plain sense of the letter taken as a whole. They were foreseen by the Holy Spirit, to whom the parable is due, and we were meant to make such applications according to our varying capacities and needs.

But it seems to us that for the real exegesis of the whole passage the reason for giving the warning contained in xix., 30, "But many that are first shall be last," etc., the warning itself, the parable which is meant to illustrate it and the repetition in xx., 16, of the words of warning must all be explained on the same lines—*i. e.,* no explanation which covers one portion, but does not cover another, can be accepted. Hence we have to ask four questions: (*a*) *Why* was this warning given? (*b*) *What* did it precisely mean? (*c*) *How* did the parable serve to illustrate it? (*d*) In what sense is it true that the first will be last and the last first?

The parable is the key to all these questions. We cannot explain the words of warning, neither their meaning nor their *raison d'etre* until we have made up our minds as to the precise teaching meant to be conveyed by the parable. What, then, to repeat St. Chrysostom's question, was Our Lord's purpose in setting it forth? What was it meant to teach us? Answers innumerable have been suggested (see above), but few will quarrel with St. Chrysostom's solution—viz., that Our Lord's purpose is to teach us that all emanates from His mercy, as is shown by the words: "They also received every man a penny. . . . Friend, I do *thee* no wrong; didst thou not agree with Me for a penny? . . . I will also *give* to this last even as to thee. Is it not lawful for Me to *do what I will?"* In other words, the parable is not meant, at least primarily, to teach us that God is essentially just, nor that all in heaven will receive the same reward—though this latter is in a sense true—but that just as the householder in the parable rewarded the last-comers equally with those who had worked all the day, simply because he chose to do so, so also, though God will reward us all according to our merits and will thus fulfill all justice, yet even in so doing He is but exercising His prerogative of mercy. And here, so at least it seems to us, is the point which has proved a stumbling-block to so many commentators, for many argue as though some would be rewarded in heaven for no merits at all; or if they fear to draw such a conclusion from the parable, they tell us that the lesson is that *we* are not the judges of a man's merits, and that those who seemingly have done far less than we who have been called at the first hour may yet have done far more in reality and in the eyes of God. But the implication underlying such an interpretation must necessarily be that those who were first called had grown slack in their work, a notion which cannot be justified by anything in the parable. Indeed, it should be noted that in the parable nothing is said about those who were called at the third, the sixth and the ninth hours; the contrast is solely between those who were called first and those who were called last, thus showing that the parable is meant to explain the words previously addressed to the Apostles, "But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." It is true that the reward given to the last-comers was due solely to the mercy of God, but is it any less true that the reward given to the first-comers was equally due to His mercy? If we understand the parable aright, its lesson is precisely this, that the whole, not merely the specially indulgent treatment meted out to the last-comers, is due to the Divine mercy. For the whole procedure of the "householder" is spontaneous; he goes out at all hours of the day, and that not for his own convenience, but for the profit of those whom he deigns to call. And if we now pass from the "householder" of the parable to Him who is thereby signified, it will be evident that in the order of grace not only was the offer of work in the vineyard purely gratuitous, but even the power to coöperate with the offer thus spontaneously made was also a gratuitous gift.

And the parable, when interpreted on these lines, affords a key to the interpretation of the other portions of Our Lord's answer. Those other portions are, as we have seen, the promise to the Apostles, the promise to all who should imitate them, the words of warning and the ultimate repetition of these latter as a species of corollary to the parable. The two promises, then, are attached to the free and spontaneous surrender of all for Christ's sake. This was an act of the *free-will* such as the rich young man had just refused to make; lest, then, the Apostles should begin to plume themselves on the sacrifice they had made, and so perhaps esteem themselves as better than others, Our Lord adds His word of solemn warning—viz., that it is not purely a question of *free-will,* but especially of *grace.* And this grace is set forth as having a threefold function—the opportunity offered to the Apostles was gratuitously proposed to them, the power to coöperate was equally gratuitous and so also was the ultimate bestowal of the reward, since it would far exceed their merits, as is indicated in the murmuring of some, according to St. Chrysostom's commentary given above.

If we now ask *why* these words of warning were spoken in xix., 30, we shall get no help from St. Chrysostom. He seems to regard them not so much as words of warning, but as a continuation of the promises made in the preceding verses to those who should leave all for Christ's sake. For he refers them to the Pharisees, as though Our Lord meant to say that the Apostles were not to think that they themselves would be at least inferior to their quondam guides who had "sitten in the chair of Moses," and St. Chrysostom repeats this when he comes to the same words at the close of the parable, though he also includes those Christians who have begun well, but afterwards fallen away. Neither does it seem possible to accept Cajetan's explanation, which he derives from his interpretation of St. Peter's question. In this he follows St. Chrysostom, at least in part, for he regards St. Peter as showing a certain dismay at the contrast between what he himself had left and what the rich young man might have left. He pictures St. Peter as supposing that the reward was to depend on the amount left rather than on the spontaneity with which we offer the little we are in a position to leave. Hence Cajetan understands the words "the first shall be last" as affording consolation to St. Peter, much as though Our Lord had said "it is not the first in this world, those namely who have the most to leave, who shall be the most rewarded; those who are the last in this world shall be the first in the next according to the completeness with which they make the sacrifice, not according to the amount they relinquish."

But if this was Our Lord's meaning, we may well ask why He added the parable at all, and still more how the parable served to illustrate His meaning? If, however, we agree that the parable primarily teaches us that all depends upon the mercy of God, we can understand *why* Our Lord spoke those words "the first shall be last," etc. They were intended to correct an underlying tendency to self-complacency as manifested in St. Peter's question, "You must indeed leave all for Me," Our Lord seems to say, "But remember that it is not merely a question of your free-will; it is a question of grace as well. You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you. And just as I have chosen you, so also I may have chosen many others unknown to you, the seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal, and of whom Elias was ignorant when he said repeatedly, 'And I alone am left.' You ask how this can be? I will show you." Our Lord then spoke the parable in which, as we have already shown, all was a work of gratuitous mercy, and He concluded: "*So* shall the last be first, and the first last."

The whole doctrine of this is wonderfully summed up in the invitatory of the Office for a Confessor according to the Dominican rite: "Confessorum Regem adoremus qui coelestis regni *meritum et gloriam* contulit sancto Suo."

When we have thus cleared the ground, so to speak, we can begin to cast about for symbolical explanations—*i. e.,* we can endeavor to see what the actors in the parable were figurative of; for, as pointed out above, it is not the words which supply the mystical sense, but the persons or things, though, of course, we can only arrive at the mystical signification of these latter by a study of the things said about them. And it is a remarkable fact that even the exegetes of the Alexandrian school who were insistent with regard to the literal sense as the foundation of all other interpretations, yet pass from the literal to the mystical without any hint that they are so doing. It is not that they were unaware of the distinction; they were fully conscious of it, but being preachers first and foremost, they naturally turned at once to the moral application of the parables. Thus for the majority of the Patristic Homilists on our present parable the "laborers" are the Patriarchs—*i. e.,* Adam, Abraham, Moses, etc. It is nowhere pointed out that this is not the literal sense of the parable, but the mystical. Indeed, it is not till we come to the later schoolmen that we find the distinction between the *parable* and the *sense of the parable* insisted on. This point is one of the distinguishing features of Cajetan's commentaries on the Gospels, and it is undoubtedly due to his care in always keeping these apart that his commentary is so exact. His treatment of the present parable affords us a good instance of his method, though, as we have seen above, his interpretation of the words of warning seem to call for improvement.

Thus St. Peter's question drew from Our Lord the most magnificent promises for those who should freely leave all and follow Him; but the possible self-complacency which underlay that question was checked by a word of warning—viz., that rewards are not merely a question of justice, but of mercy; both are in the hands of God, who is a patient rewarder; it is not for us to judge His acts, and that though free-will must play its part, grace must play a far larger part.

Hugh Pope, O. P.

Rome, Italy.

SIR ROBERT ANDERSON'S "PARNELLISM AND CRIME."

IN a series of chapters published in *Blackwood's Magazine* since October last, and not yet concluded, an ex-official of the Home Office and Dublin Castle furnishes his biography from 1867 until he retired in 1901, with the respectable pension of £900 a year. What induced this gentleman, Sir Robert Anderson, a Knight of the Bath, to speak of many matters presented in his articles is plain enough from the temper of the documents, and can be also fairly enough inferred from the history of the Tory party ever since the great reform act of 1832 opened the constitution to the commercial classes and to the substantial mechanics and smaller shopkeepers. The act, having regard to the conditions of the time, was a great emancipation of industry, energy and ability, but the masses were left without political rights.

I am not prepared to say that the compromise made with the landed gentry was unwise. It may have saved England from a civil war, the issue of which would be hard to foresee. The army was in the hands of the oligarchy in Church and State, which controlled the King and treated all ranks outside the squirearchy and ecclesiastical magistracy[1] as they were treated under the early Plantagenets and again under the House of Tudor, when it was the privilege of blood and birth to rob merchants and shopkeepers, graziers and artisans on every road from York to London.[2] The "Peterloo Massacre" well enough indicates what the governing class was prepared to do. Rather than concede manhood suffrage or even household suffrage, the protection of the ballot and the disfranchisement of those seats of bargain and sale, the close boroughs, they were prepared for a new Edgehill without thinking that a Naseby and a Marston Moor and a Whitehall scaffold closed the history of the sovereign whom they had made the upholder of their violence and pride. The Whig leaders abandoned much and the advisers of the oligarchs sternly recommended them to concede a little in order to preserve a great deal.

This in brief is the story and extent of the great reform act, which Mr. Warren in his novel, "Ten Thousand a Year," sarcastically and mendaciously entitles the "act to give everybody everything." We are face to face to-day with issues important as those of the later twenties and earlier thirties of the nineteenth century. The only utility I can conceive in Anderson's articles is that they uncover to a large extent the undying Bourbonese hatred of the landed gentry for everything that savors of democracy. He must have thought his articles useful; for he tells the reader that a friend informed him they would be of great service to the party. This, of course, explains their acceptance by the editor, a shrewd and able man, who could hardly have been impressed by the schoolboy horseplay of the Home Office, the vulgarity of the late Lord Morris and Killannin, which did duty as Irish wit; "the maiden speech" in the Historical Society of Trinity, when Anderson triumphed over his nervousness; the inanities and spitefulnesses in every page; the egregious vanity whose offensiveness is almost unmarked by consideration of its phenomenal folly. The editor, I say, must have seen that the revival of the terrible story told in the *Times* under the title "Parnellism and Crime" might utterly shatter the government of the poor man's budget, of the Lords' veto, of the licensing bill, of Welsh disestablishment, the avant-courier of English, of the one man one vote policy—in a word, the government by economic opportunity for all subjects of the Crown, whether they are Anglo-Saxon aliens, Irish helots or Scotch crofters on the fringes of ducal and lordly deer-forests.

---

[1] The squire-parsons, who are merciless on the country benches, are known as the "squarsons."

[2] The only police in Europe was the splendidly organized Holy Brotherhood in Spain at the time I speak of, viz., under the Tudors. I might add there was no effective police in England until Peel's.

Sir Robert Anderson was secretary to the Prison Commission, an office of sinister importance when one is aware that political prisoners were serving long terms, even in some cases terms for life. People have read of Russian dungeons and the visits of the tempter to the inmate. We had passionate appeals to civilized Europe to terminate the atrocities in Neapolitan and Venetian prisons, which prepared the way for the official and the informer to gloze on the beauties of nature in sky and air, mountain, river, wood to the broken-spirited, ragged, vermin-covered, manacled and fettered creature breathing fetid air in a place dark as the grave. Will those who have read of the approach of the Russian police officer, of the Austrian and Italian jailer be surprised that Fenian convicts in English jails were argumentatively requested to win freedom and reward by "recollecting" matters to convict Parnell or his colleagues of participation in dynamite plots or otherwise to aid the case of the *Times* before what we call the Parnell Commission? Sir Robert Anderson, who has claimed the authorship of the *Times* articles on which the act of Parliament constituting this commission was based, had the virtual control over access to the prisons in which the political offenders were incarcerated. He considers everything he has done, even the writing of the *Times* articles from information obtained as a commissioner of police in control of secret service, as performed in the pursuance of duty and therefore only deserving commendation.

It is not, then, a very violent assumption, apart from other sources of knowledge, if we suggest that he gave permits to visit the prisoners to the agents of the *Times*. The detectives and other persons who went on this work—their activity came out in cross-examination by Parnell's counsel—must have obtained the "permits" from some one belonging to the Prison Commission. I should find it hard to think an English gentleman would be a party to a proceeding of this kind. I am sure no Irish gentleman would be unless he was one of the detestable brood generated in the decomposition of subordinate Dublin Castle officialdom. Great crimes have been committed by high personages in that palace of violence and fraud, but they wore more the character of public acts in defiance or contempt of opinion than the subtle and chicane performances of the pettyfogger of Green street or the spy hunting for blood-money or any other creeping reptile of the Castle gate. It was from this abode of venality the arrangement went out under which counsel for men awaiting their trials on a charge of treason sent their briefs for perusal to the Crown; from this seat of fatal policy it was that "the deputy" of the superseded sheriff terrified jurors, bought jurors or drenched their brains with copious whisky until in their fear, or confusion, or purchase they found the required verdicts. It is idle to speak of this as ancient history. Sir Robert Anderson, Mr. Campbell,[3] the Tory members who yelled the name "dynamitards" at the Irish members the other day, Mr. Balfour, who flung the entire blame for the creating of that monstrous tribunal, the Parnell Commission, on the man who had most to dread from its Tudor constitution and the prejudices of its members than any other—these men one and all prove that the passions, instincts, the hatred and the scorn which were the inspirations of Dublin Castle rule of old are the motives at the bottom of Tory government of four-fifths of the Irish nation to-day.

That Anderson's action may be better understood we shall change his autobiography into a biography, but condense it considerably. We have already mentioned that he held the post of secretary of the Prison Commission, and we have now to say in express terms that he was a Commissioner of Police and head of the criminal investigation department. He speaks of himself as "political adviser of the Home Secretary," and tells us that this high functionary was highest of all the Secretaries of State. This has no bearing on the action of the Home Office with regard to Parnell and the Irish members, except so far as Anderson might be supposed to hold the threads of the Fenian conspiracy in Ireland, England and America in his hands, and this by virtue of the superiority of the Home Office over the

---

[3] Irish Attorney-General for the late Government.

Irish Office in London and that mysterious and Oriental-like home of absolutism, Dublin Castle.[4]

Taking the early part of his official existence into account, it appears that, according to a Treasury minute, his "service for pension" dates from 1867. Of course, we are not told of the services of that year. They do not appear in the civil service estimates or the Treasury accounts. We only know from Sir Robert Anderson that the Treasury is a sort of embodied meanness which refuses to pay volunteers or unplaced place-hunters, and gives its reasons in language not easily borne by impostors. At any rate the Treasury clerks were beaten and the unrecorded services of 1867 must have been paid there and then and counted as the beginning of his pension date.

That he had a right to recognition for services in that year any one must admit who has any knowledge of the devious and unscrupulous paths of political service in Ireland. That was the year the most formidable, because the most capable of the American Fenians were expected in Ireland and England. There were some Americans in hiding in both countries. It appears there was a brisk manufacture and sale of revolvers in England and an exportation of them to Ireland, while some of the lesser Irish leaders who had not been made amenable in 1865-6 were visiting various parts of the country in disguise. I have no doubt all this was known to Anderson in London, as it was known in every apartment of the Castle and every police barrack in Ireland. The habeas corpus act had been suspended; so there was ample power to force the movement underneath the surface. Instead of doing this, the police and their sub-inspectors contented themselves with irritating persons whom they disliked or who were obnoxious to the small gentry in the commission of the peace as agents of estates,[5] and who in this way made themselves prominent.

Some thirty Irish-Americans crossed the ocean in a small vessel at this time, but were arrested on their landing on the west coast. I have an idea that all, or most of them, had passed through the changes of the Civil War on one side or the other and had held rank as commissioned officers. One regrets it, it is so much of the old, old story, but if his historic memory goes back passionately to those who came from the Danube and the Guadalquiver, the Seine and the Maine, when the first really Irish Parliament exercised sovereign power for a brief period in Kilkenny, he cannot deny at least his admiration to those gallant gentlemen who came as a forlorn hope in 1867 to redress seven centuries of contumely—contumely harder to bear than infinite inexpiable wrongs. Men can die as in the dragonnades of Elizabeth and Cromwell, or starve as in the footsteps of fire left by Mountjoy and Carew and a thousand others, but to be called ferocious savages or cowards without the gall to make oppression bitter, by every scribe who lives by libel, by every spouter who earns the wages of mendacity on the platforms of Chamberlain and Balfour demands a patience which only an immortal hope for the yet unborn can confer.

---

[4] The claims put forward for the Home Office are technically correct, and the statement that the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant is not one of the principal Secretaries of State may be admitted. I question the view that the Lord Lieutenant is under the control of the Home Secretary, although the late Isaac Butt thought so. Byrne v. Hartington would contradict him.

[5] I confess I cannot understand that time. I can say the police officers and their men behaved with great fairness to the body of the people. I am inclined to think that when some over-zealous magistrates and others desired persons to be subjected to domiciliary visits or to be arrested they were not always gratified. A prudent R. M. can keep a district in peace which the ordinary practices would drive to insurrection.

As I was saying, Anderson held office for the Home Department in connection with crime generally, and political crime in particular, but as I understand he did not in 1867 play the part of a secret policeman in Dublin Castle so much as that of an illuminator of witnesses. If any one in prison under a charge of treason preferred the witness-box to the dock, why, Mr. Robert Anderson, barrister-at-law, could prove himself a guide, philosopher and friend. The instruction of the informer Massey opened a career to the young barrister. He was receiving briefs already from his brother, Mr. Lee Anderson, Crown Solicitor at the Castle, which means Crown Solicitor for all Ireland. It is significant that Anderson never appeared in the prosecutions in Green street in 1867. Could it be possible that counsel for the Crown refused to act with him? This is a question I should like to have answered. If Sir Robert Anderson was persona grata to Liberal and Tory Home Secretaries; if he were on terms of domestic intimacy with them; if the fierce old Liberal, Sir William Harcourt, paid court to him while snubbing great officers of state, I should wish to know if he were such an abomination to Irish law officers and their colleagues, why was he so unsavory? What caused the professional putrifaction? For the sake of the most honorable institution in the world, for what at one time was the greatest bar in the world, I should like to know the inner merits of this dissociation. It is a plain matter. It is not involved in the shrouds of motive like Mr. Smith's offer of the services of Sir R. Webster, the Tory Attorney-General, to Parnell as his counsel. Mr. Smith, as leader of the House of Commons, controlled the situation, but he did not control the Attorney-General. The latter must have assented to the chivalrous rôle of defending

Parnell from the conspiracy of the Tories and the *Times*. I cannot quite understand the incident, but I assume that Mr. Smith meant to deal fairly with Parnell and the incriminated Irish members, with Davitt and such other champions of landlordism as disguised their real feelings by founding the Land League and inaugurating the plan of campaign.[6] Mr. Smith may have known the secret sentiments of the party of Parnellism and crime. Again, Sir Richard Webster was said to be a very pious man, given to much church-going. No one can say, then, he would take a leaf from the book of that horrible and Godless MacNally, who betrayed his clients in Ireland. Mr. Smith[7] and Sir Richard Webster were *arcades ambo,* which means "Tories both" or "churchmen both." Strafford warned the House of Lords against raising the sleeping lions of despotic precedent. The Tory party ought not to thank Sir Robert Anderson for awaking the unparalleled infamy which slept in the grave of the wretched Pigott and on the fields of South Africa, where forty thousand soldiers died, to distract attention from the conspirators against Parnell and the honor of the English people.

The late proceedings in Parliament are astonishing. Mr. Balfour seems to believe, as Anderson does, in what is called "the guilty knowledge" of Parnell. This is a long sustained baseness, for one can hardly say where it began. But for the moment suppose this "guilty knowledge" goes back at least to the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and the Under Secretary, Mr. Burke, in 1882? Anderson states himself outgeneraled and Mr. Balfour's opinion loses the credit even of a dialectical[8] doubt. "The guilty knowledge" of this matter rests on the first Pigott letter. Anderson himself admits what the inquiry in Dublin Castle in a sort of French police office under a police magistrate established—that there was no connection between the Land League and the score of fools and desperadoes who called themselves "The Invincibles." Unhappy Pigott admitted in writing before Mr. Labouchere and Mr. George Augustus Sala that he forged the letter, every word of it, the signature, and explained the manner in which he accomplished the forgery. He admitted the same on cross-examination. His flight and suicide followed, as everybody knows.

It seems clear to me that Mr. Balfour is so much in the habit of using words as counters that his sentences become as ambiguous as a Delphic oracle. Why should Parnell take an action against the *Times* when he knew that he did not write the letter in question or any of the letters sold to the *Times*? He was not an employe of the government or of Mr. Smith. When Lord Spencer, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, compelled the Secretary of the Post Office to take an action against Mr. W. O'Brien it was another matter. Lord Spencer himself paid no attention to the libels of Mr. Healy, a reserve exactly on all fours with Mr. Parnell's.

---

[6] This expedient was canonically condemned. The context shows the meaning of reference.

[7] He was known as Old Morality.

[8] Has it never occurred to anybody that Mr. Balfour's book should be a vindication of dialectical doubt and not of philosophic?

This I wish to make clear even at the cost of drawing out this article to a greater length than I might desire. In the debate on Anderson's pension Mr. Balfour declared with unusual asperity that a tribunal described, and correctly described, as unconstitutional by the Home Secretary[9] and which was set up to ruin the political adversaries of the government was appointed for their benefit. The charges against Mr. Parnell and his colleagues and allies that they were guilty of promoting and sustaining a treasonable and murderous association whose ramifications extended throughout Ireland, the large towns of England, the United States and, as I gather, in a more guarded manner through parts of Canada and parts of the great provinces of Oceanica were to be tried by this unfair tribunal. In a compendious form the activities and dooms of this world-wide conspiracy were expressed in the title "Parnellism and Crime," the caption of the *Times* articles.

Through these various malignant, paralyzing and deadly crimes Parnell and his followers were to march to Home Rule. Something like this Mr. Balfour once said. Mr. Disraeli said something with the same meaning in that bizarre and un-English rhetoric of which he was a master. I think it was that the Irish Party were moving through treason to the decomposition of the empire. Now if Parnell were identified in Balfour's mind with the assassinations in the Phœnix Park on the 6th of May, 1882; with certain terrible acts of peasants in the west of Ireland earlier still; with boycotting carried to a degree far beyond the non-intercourse of Innocent III.'s Interdict when John was making the mansions and castles of his barons theatres of his insane licentiousness; with the relentless councils of the Clan-na-Gael, I can only wonder why in the policy of "resolute government" he did not find some method like the Invincibles to "remove" him.

Be it remembered that an English gentleman of high birth and considerable estate, Mr. Wilfred Scawen Blunt, was informed by Mr. Balfour when he was entering on the government of Ireland that he intended, under the exceptionally oppressive act just passed, to deal in such a way with the Irish members that there would be an end to Home Rule. The reader may have heard that one of the items of the method was to deny them, if sent to jail under the act in question—popularly known as the crimes act and also spoken of as the jubilee coercion act—the treatment of political prisoners. They were to be dealt with as felons lying in jail for robbery with violence, or the crime of the convicted ravisher, or of the murderer whose sentence had been commuted to penal servitude for life. That he did not kill Parnell and some others must be held due to Blunt's revelation, but Blunt himself paid for it in Galway jail,[10] while Shaw Lefevre came to Ireland in defiance of him with the openly avowed intention of holding a public meeting. Balfour blustered, but Shaw Lefevre held his meeting and went back to England unscathed.

---

[9] Mr. W. Churchill.

The sort of terror prevailing in Ireland under Balfour's administration in 1887-8 was due to Anderson's *Times* letters, so he says. No doubt he has since given credit to others for the "native" documents, as I may call them, while he supplied the articles known as "Behind the Scenes in America," the materials for which came and had been coming for twenty years from a spy and *agent provocateur* named Beach, living there under the name of Le Caron. To Anderson Beach wrote, and the latter kept the letters in his own house until Beach wanted them to refresh his memory before entering the box at the Parnell Commission.[11] The mode in which the construction of evidence to be given by Beach was carried out is instructive. Anderson selected some forty documents from the mass that had accumulated. There were reports of Clan-na-Gael meetings, resolutions of all kinds, names of proposers, seconders, debaters; and one may say without improbability that there may have been foolish and dangerous things said by irresponsible and inconsiderate persons which would cast grave suspicion on Parnell and his friends if the connection between the Irish movement and the Clan-na-Gael or any physical force party alleged by the *Times* were once established.

Anderson sifted the documents and a man named Houston thitherto an employe of the Property Defense Association, the organization of Irish landlords against the tenants' trade union known as the Land League, gave them a second sifting in the interest of the *Times*. Le Caron was a failure. The only attempt at germane evidence was a statement that he had half an hour's interview with Parnell in the House of Commons, at which meeting he communicated, if I recollect rightly, a message which if true might warrant a suspicion that the Irish leader was leaning on the support of extreme men in America. The interview, according to Le Caron, took place in the lobby of the House of Commons. No one would believe that half an hour's treason secrets, dynamite and dagger secrets would be interchanged where people were passing to and fro every second and police in uniform were standing and probably Anderson's own secret police were gliding in and out. At any rate, the stern reserve of Parnell was of incomparable value at this moment. He described this man's accosting him and his own passing away without condescending to notice him. The passionless contempt of Parnell seems to have irritated Beach, for there seemed to me, as I read the evidence long ago, that Beach spoke of the occasion with some excitement. If we can believe Anderson,[12] and on this matter I accept his statement, he asked to be allowed into the witness-box to corroborate Beach's version of the meeting with Parnell. Sir Henry James would not hear of it, though Sir Richard Webster was desirous he should be examined. Sir Henry's excuse was that he had too great a respect for Anderson to subject him to a cross-examination by Russell, and it was suspected, moreover, that Russell knew all about the authorship of the *Times* letters.

---

[10] Might I take the liberty of asking why Shaw Lefevre was not batoned by the police, put in jail, compelled to perform degrading offices for the common prisoners and compelled to wear the prison garb? Why were not the Marquis of Ripon and the now Lord Morley subjected to these indignities for holding public meetings in Ireland?

[11] Mr. Churchill has obliged Anderson to give Beach's letters up to the Home Office. They are public property, but one may ask: Why, after Beach's testimony, the then Home Secretary did not demand them?

Taking all this apart, there is only one bit of truth in the account—namely, Anderson's idiotic request to enter the witness-box. Sir R. Webster was the leader, and consequently controlled the conduct of the case. If he wished to examine Anderson he had only to insist upon doing so. He could take a witness even out of James' hands in the course of examination, whether in chief or in cross-examination. It would not have been safe to expose Anderson to the tender mercies of Russell, for the authors of the *Times* letters would be wrung from him and the complicity of the Home Office, the management of the campaign in Ireland, the employment of the police there, the eager services of Crown solicitors and the solicitors of every member of the Property Defense Association, the looking at all these manifestations of activity through his fingers *in more Scotico* by Mr. Balfour—all this might have been dragged out to the ruin of the Unionist party; nay, certainly would have been dragged out. But there is another point—Sir Henry James clearly did not believe Beach's statement, and it is highly probable if Sir R. Webster ever believed it, that he saw its improbability when considering the man's demeanor, his pushing officiousness, which would be so distasteful to a man so cold and haughty as Parnell. Anderson was not present; he simply took Beach's account of the meeting; so all his evidence would amount to would be that Beach gave him the narrative within half an hour of the so-called interview, and that it was in the terms of his testimony to the commission.

---

[12] There is good reason to disbelieve him where it is his interest to misrepresent matters. For instance, he states that he had the permission of Mr. Monroe, the Police Commissioner, his superior, to write the *Times* articles. Monroe has contradicted him. It would be unlikely that a shrewd old Scotchman would permit such a breach of discipline.

I have spent a good deal of time over Anderson, but his connection with imperial forces about him—Liberal Unionists on the warpath against Gladstone, Tories adding ramparts to the Established Church and the massive structure of the landed interest—his connection with these forces lifts him from the level of a policeman apparently victimized by his spies, an Irish hunter after fortune, by the base and intricate ways of the prison tempter and the manufacturer of testimony. In this character of the go-between of Secretaries of State and the shady instruments by which they uphold law and order he is a curious study; in this character of moulding or at least starting one of the greatest conspiracies against a political party since Italian republics passed into the night of history he is more than interesting. Why, even in his old age his incredulity as to Parnell's acquittal serves as an inspiration to Mr. Balfour, and what the most charitable would characterize as the obstinacy of age works on young Tories as a call to arms.

It is amazing that a person like him—like what he must have been in youth and what he is to-day—should be the means of causing that frost-bound politician, Mr. Arthur Balfour, to boil and erupt lava-tides of unforeseeing eloquence. It would appear that a political or a class passion carefully hidden for a long time under the carefully acted poses of reserve will break out. Balfour, who plays the part of an aristocrat in the Greek sense of the word, lacks the consciousness of inborn aristocracy.

He is an academical aristocrat in the way that the late Lord Beaconsfield was a cavalier and a High Churchman; but the meaning here is that these aristocrats of the stage, of the poetry-book hate the people with a greater hate than the long descended squires, ducal or armigeral. Mr. Balfour is too near the masses with his Indian nabob blood not to feel in his soul the bitter passion of the freed man's son,[13] who in his way was as fine a gentleman as Disraeli tried to be. But if, since poor old Anderson's thick-headed vanity has opened the page of aristocratic intolerance anew, the English Commons allow themselves to forget the terrible circumcision from the Norman Conquest until yesterday, they are the degenerate descendants of the bold artisans and tradesmen who told a Plantagenets ministry if they submitted to lawless levies they were like Frenchmen, no longer free. For the present that danger is over. The proud baronage must pay on their lands what they have escaped since the commutation of the military tenures. The idea of demanding their share of the burdens of the country has almost caused a revolution. Just fancy, the Percys were forever in the saddle with their tenants and their followers to defend the border; the present Duke of Northumberland is now to pay a small percentage of the annual value which his predecessors have been escaping since the seventeenth century. Murrough O'Brien, Earl of Thomond, obtained a grant of the great estate of St. Mary's Abbey in consideration of maintaining men at arms and archers to help in the defense of the city of Dublin against the "mere Irish" and degenerate English of the metropolitan counties. What does the recently ennobled Hamilton pay out of that extensive and rich possession which passed by mortgage to his ancestor, one Ian Trant Hamilton? Anderson's articles were well intended to divert attention from the landlords and the English Church. I am afraid they failed in showing that an alliance between Liberals and Irishmen to pursue a policy of justice to the people at large is a greater evil than the maintenance of the power and privileges of the squires.

---

[13] "Odi profanum vulgus et arceo" would be insolent enough for the Mulberry-faced dictator or his ancestor, the decemvir. "Don't hesitate to shoot!" By the way, Balfour consented to inquire into the conduct of the police at Mitchelstown. Bob Acres feared the English "plebs."

The escape was a marvelous one; for a person acquainted with the fluctuations of opinion in England may be prepared for any change, any excitement. It was on this the Tories reckoned, and in pursuance of this the venerable magazine launched Anderson on the public. He has shown a certain skill in the interweaving of side lights of Irish life with the graver matters of assassination, civil war and separation. It was not without a motive he bears testimony to the liberality and courtesy of the Catholic gentlemen educated in Trinity. Professor Maguire, a Catholic in that institution, supplied, if I mistake not, the £500 to purchase the forged letters from Pigott. When Mr. Balfour had been appealed to he recommended the agent to offer them to the *Times*. Others, including a Duke, refused to negotiate. It was this Catholic professor in Trinity, a man of limited means, who first vouched for the credit of those forged letters written in confirmation of Anderson's articles on "Parnellism and Crime" or his part of them.[14]

---

[14] I am compelled to say that men who fully approved of the result looked for by the publications in the *Times* and the forged "autograph" letters remarked that four Catholics were important workers in the iniquitous scheme. One Mr. Woulfe Flanagan, I am sorry for his father's son; another Sir Roland Blennerhassit; a third Maguire, and the fourth Pigott. I know that Mr. Woulfe-Flanagan's father hated the Land League movement, and possibly the young man believed that it resorted to extremes in Ireland.

With Anderson's "political advice" to the five Home Secretaries with whom "he worked" I have no concern, but I think it a serious thing he should be allowed to publish in a respectable organ like *Blackwood* his pretended belief—it cannot be anything else—that the Home Rule party were "dynamitards." I have just referred to his view of Catholics educated in Trinity. Very well; I add that among the promoters of the Home Rule movement the very earliest advocates were Professors Galbraith and Haughton, two Protestant clergymen of the then lately Disestablished Church. It would be an impertinence for me, writing to Irishmen or educated Englishmen, to say anything in praise of these most estimable and most distinguished gentlemen. Writing to Americans, I can say their scientific attainments were worthy of the university that led the sister island from the time of George Berkeley to the time of Salmon and Dowden, Lloyd and Ingram in the walks of exact and speculative science and literary criticism of that type which approximates to the severity of scientific analysis while preserving the brilliancy and the glow which make literature an inner world, rivalling external nature in its effect upon the imagination and the heart.

From the latest demonstrations in the House of Commons we learn that the Tories still profess the belief that "dynamitards," "assassins," "Invincibles," "Fenians," "Parnellites," "Home Rulers" are not even varieties of one political species, but are one and the same party, bearing different names for travel and social admission. Why, this was the very essence of Anderson's ideas as transplanted in the mind of the informer Beach. To give vraisemblance to what I think was particularly called "the autograph letter," Pigott makes Parnell, while regretting the accident of Cavendish's death, express the opinion that Burke "met only with his deserts." Soames, the *Times'* solicitor, and MacDonald, the manager, I think, swore to the authenticity, because it was like what Parnell would write. Irishmen have a difficult line along which to walk. The landed interest and the Established Church are committed to a view of what Irishmen are; then if the informer, or perjurer, or conspirator invents some rascality fitting into this view as written by an Irishman, of course he wrote it. In vain does the victim prove that he could not have written it; in vain the forger admits the forgery; the prejudice of the privileged classes in Church and State has stamped the Irishman as "an incorrigible and predestinated criminal."

At any rate, I might be allowed to suggest as reasonable the opinion that if Nationalists pursue their objects by the recognized methods of parliamentary warfare, they are entitled to be listened to, and, what is more, trusted. In this series in *Blackwood* Anderson tells an anecdote of Disraeli which I apply here. When Jonathan Pim went up to the speaker to take the oath after his election for Dublin Disraeli asked: "What is that?" He was told. He replied: "I always thought an Irish member was a gentleman or a blackguard, but he is neither." There is more than meets the ear in this retort of Disraeli's. The Tory always looked upon the Irish Tory member as possibly a gentleman, the Liberal as a blackguard. I am exceeding my space, but I should like to speak of the contempt with which Irishmen, despite their services in policy and arms, were regarded across the Channel. Fancy that a man spawned in a colony in the days of its struggling infancy spoke of Irishmen as "aliens." I have the highest respect for our brethren of the Celtic fringe, but I think Irishmen, despite Mr. Arthur Balfour's "Don't hesitate to shoot," which is the translation of his uncle's description, Hottentots are as much entitled as Scotchmen to a place in the empire which they have done so much to build up. The pretence of Tories willing to wound, but afraid to strike, is that the Liberals have dishonored themselves, have expunged themselves from the society of gentlemen and "honorable members" by their alliance with the Irish and the Labor representatives.

Be it so. But despite conspiracies of "the gentlemen of England" and their Andersons, Beaches and Pigotts—all honorable men—all serving the State, despite the scorn with which these honorable men regard the laborer of industry, one may venture to say that the Labor member, seeking for justice toward him whose hands are maintaining "the gentlemen of England" and their companions in arms—such associates as Anderson, who explicitly denies that he was "an agent provocateur;"[15] Beach, a man whose life was one continued, circumstantial, elaborate infamy, that one who cannot deny that he made or tried to make criminals to betray them, as Anderson does, and Pigott—despite the conspiracies and *the scorn of these honorable men,* the Irish and Labor M. P. may rise in the morning and seek their rest at night with the consciousness that they are not like "the gentlemen of England" or Anderson, Beach and Pigott.

If I have not succeeded in incriminating the Unionist party—the landlords of England and Ireland and the Church Establishment as a territorial keep in the possession of the landlords—I say if I have not succeeded in showing that this party was leagued in a conspiracy with the *Times,* every word of this paper has been wasted. Anything more immoral than the conduct of the Tory party no one can conceive. Lord Carnarvon in 1885 was prepared on behalf of Lord Salisbury to enter into an arrangement for the Irish vote at the election then looming.[16] Carnarvon had been Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and became while there a convert to Home Rule. He was a most high-minded man, and had he thought that Parnell was behind the "knives" and the murders in the Park in 1882, he would not have approached him in 1885. No one ever had the slightest doubt of Lord Salisbury's adhesion to the pourparlers of Carnarvon and Parnell, the only doubt was with respect to the extent of the concession. He spoke of Parnell as the one man in the three kingdoms who knew what he wanted, and the whole Tory party bowed to the conception of the "Dictator," as they called him. In 1886 Gladstone brought in his Home Rule bill. He was beaten. He appealed to the country; was cast in a minority. Lord Salisbury took office, Mr Balfour went as Chief Secretary to Ireland, and then began the dragooning of the peasants, the arresting of Irish members, editors, priests, public men of all kinds and the prison episodes of what Lord Salisbury described with very bad taste as Mr. O'Brien's "tragic nudity."

---

[15] Did any one say he was? He admits the Home Office might go to the verge, but not become actual makers of criminals. The idea of a man trained in the Crown Solicitors' entourage of 1867 jibbing even at the name must be due to meeting decent men in the Home Office. If not this, I give it up.

From this forth the plot against Parnell and his colleagues entered the domain of action. The elements were being industriously collected ever since Anderson corrupted the wretched Massey in the Dublin police office or Kilmainham jail. There was no scruple allowed to stand in the way. Mr. Forster, the Chief Secretary in 1880-1, was in the hands of Pigott, a man whose reputation in Dublin was so fetid that every clerk in the Castle, every inspector of police, every sergeant, every one of the three thousand men who patroled the streets from Dollymount to Pembroke road knew it. Protestants spoke in mysterious terms of the children of a Catholic gentleman cast upon their charity.[17] Forster himself had fallen into the hands of the permanent clerks, and these for the occasion valued the letters from their country cousins in the magistracy. In 1882, that May day in which Forster's successor and the Under Secretary were murdered, a gloom palpable as the darkness of Egypt fell upon the country. To suppose that Anderson really believed that Parnell was not sincere in his denunciation is to make him out one of those pernicious minds so much under the dominion of political hatred that the feeling will occasionally take the form of personal malignity. Parnell was really in despair. He offered to Ministers to resign his seat and retire from public life.

---

[16] What is meant by the stab to Redmond by the present Prime Minister when their own party, under its greatest chief since Peel, was ready to bargain with Parnell?

[17] I did not know that the children were Pigott's. I only heard of him as a man too sensible to believe in the wild articles in the papers, but this hardly convinced me of his honesty.

He could do no less. It was a moment of immense conciliation offered by the imperial nation. It would take too much space to present the considerations leading to this view. One may suffice. Forster was a tower of strength in advanced Liberalism. I believe his being sent to Ireland was mainly due to Charles Russell, then the easily acknowledged leader of the Liberal bar. To supersede him, as Gladstone had done, against the wishes of Catholic and Protestant landlords, the opinion of old friends like Bright and Hartington, Palmer and all the Whigs and moderate Radicals in the Cabinet, in the administration, in the houses, was an act no other Minister would dare to execute. His successor, so far as I have ever heard, was in full sympathy with the land legislation, and he was a member of the great house of Cavendish. The son of a great Irish and a great English landlord was the man to undo the insolent and exasperating policy of Forster, who hated the developed land legislation, though he had not a perch of land himself.

The enemies of the people could only see in this murder a vindication of the harsh government which won for the ex-Chief Secretary the ill-omened name of Buckshot, and, of course, the recreant Radical could only behold in these assassinations a judicial punishment of the great Minister who had dismissed him.

Yet the signature to Parnell's so-called autograph letter is held to be genuine by Anderson, and yet this gentleman admits the murders were committed, as we have said, by a murderous trade union started by two brothers of the name of Carey, in order to secure for themselves the monopoly for the paving, and, I think, building contracts from the Corporation of Dublin.

I am now done. I may on a future occasion find room for much that I have omitted, for the expansion of some things too briefly stated. But this much I may say in closing as suggestive of the part played by the Unionist government in the conspiracy of those sad and awful years, that as every one in Scotland, England and Ireland knew what exertions the *Times* was making to provide evidence, that the jails were ransacked, that the chambers of the Castle[18] were asked to give their secrets, that police barracks were centres of activity, it is inconceivable that the Home Secretary was ignorant and his subordinates silent, notwithstanding the idleness, the gossip, the reciprocities of sarcasm or the interchanges of curiosity of which Sir Robert Anderson writes so genially.[19]

---

[18] Family communications I mean, of course, in the shape of complaints about incendiary fires, cattle mutilation, threats, boycotting, and so on.

GEORGE MCDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York City.

THE IRONY OF FATE AS BEHELD IN MADAGASCAR.

M. AUGAGNEUR, Governor of the French colony called Madagascar, is now enjoying a visit to his native France. Judging from the terms in which he is referred to by Protestant organs here and in Great Britain, he is no friend to any form of Christianity. The inference is probably true. His employers, the French Government, at this particular epoch, have not attempted to dissemble their feelings toward Christianity, or, indeed, for that matter, any religious cult which does not acknowledge the State to be the highest object of human devotion and the present Republican *régime* as the authority entitled to the claim of the Bourbon monarch, "I am the State." When the heavy hand of that State began at first to make itself felt on one Church only, the organs of the sects did not make any attempt to dissemble their feelings either; and for so much sincerity they deserve to get credit. In Madagascar the sects they represent had long had their day, and they made the most of their opportunity to triumph over the earlier missionary Church there, the Catholic, while they enjoyed the royal favor. The reduction of the island to a French prefecture, in the year 1850, brought a great accession of strength to the long feeble and tottering Catholic missions; but it likewise brought heavy reinforcements in men and money from the English missionary headquarters, and a violent anti-Catholic propaganda, with shocking outrages on native and foreign Catholics, as a corollary.

---

[19] It is only reasonable to assume that in the double sifting of the Le Caron documents that Anderson, a detective police minister, and Houston, the agent of the *Times* newspaper, selected the most damnatory documents. It is well to add that the American Fenian and Clan-na-Gael papers sent by Le Caron during the twenty years from 1867 until the Parnell commission were not originals. His statement on oath was that he could not keep the originals longer than a week. What interpolations might have been introduced one cannot think. The documents were, of course, only used at the commission to refresh his memory, but they probably supplied conversational material to Houston and to Anderson himself. Houston, as the ex-secretary of the Property Defense Association, may have had pabulum for his former employers. At any rate, the way the whole of the landed interest in Ireland speaks of the tenants, and particularly of the Irish members of Parliament, is more like the declarations of instructed anger than the incoherent utterances of changing passion. They have got out of their difficulties marvelously well. The *Times* has not been so fortunate, yet surely the newspaper deserved as well of "the prominent partner" as the gentlemen who have been the difficulty of the United Kingdom since the Union, as they were the framers of the penal code before it.

American and British histories and geographies, with easy insouciance, tell the reader that "Christianity was introduced into Madagascar by the London Missionary Society in 1810-28. True history tells us that it was introduced nearly two centuries earlier than that era. A French Huguenot settler, named Pronis, who had established a station on the neighboring island of Bourbon (the Isle of France), founded another on Madagascar and built a fort, which he called after the Dauphin. He had Catholics in his train, as well as Huguenots, and he encouraged them in their religion, as well as their labor, with wise generosity. History says that the well-meant efforts of Pronis and his followers resulted in no gain for the cause of Christianity.

In 1648 a more systematic effort was made. At the request or command of the Congregation of the Propaganda a missionary band was despatched by the saintly Vincent de Paul to the shores of Madagascar. The work was so hard and the climate so adverse that the heroic little band dropped out one by one, while five more of the brotherhood who had been sent to reinforce them met with shipwreck off the Cape of Good Hope and never reached Madagascar. The successor of St. Vincent de Paul, Father René Almeras, a short time after his appointment, despatched another band, who reached the island in safety. The French King, Louis XIV., determined to abandon the island and forbade French vessels to touch there. At that time there were four of the missionaries alive. Two of these returned to France, one was burned alive by the natives and the other was killed in a less shocking fashion. After this there were no renewals of Catholic missionary effort until 1844. There had been some independent work by Father Stephen, a Lazarist, as mentioned by the Abbé Rohon in his "History of Madagascar." He endeavored to win over a powerful chief named Menangne, a faithful ally of the French, and some of his followers, but it does not appear to have been a successful attempt, as the abbé's work does not give any record of the results.

At length, in 1844, something more promising was undertaken. The Rev. Father Dalmont, of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, who, when stationed at Bourbon, was appointed Prefect Apostolic for Madagascar, called the Society of Jesus to his aid. Soon a little band, under the leadership of Father Cotain, landed at St. Augustine's Bay, on the west coast of the island. They found a party of Methodist missionaries from London on the ground before them;

and these had gained such influence with the government and some of the natives that they were able to neutralize the efforts of the newcomers. The ruler of Madagascar at the time was a woman of a sanguinary and masculine temperament, a pagan, Queen Ranavalona I., one of the wives of the monarch, Radama I., who succeeded to the throne upon that King's death. She began a savage persecution of all Christians, Catholics and others, but was halted for a time in her bloody work by the accession of her son, Radama II., who had become a follower of Christianity and made a treaty of commerce with France.

The aborigines in Madagascar are classified by ethnologists as Malayan, yet the physiognomy suggests a large admixture of Hindoo blood. The Malayan strain asserts itself in the cruelty of its character. When this revolting trait manifests itself in the female gender, the lowest point is reached. Such was the case in regard to some of the Madagascar Queens. They were as cruel as the English Tudors or the Russian Romanoffs—and this is saying a great deal. The most cruel of all the Queens who are known to modern history appears to have been Ranavolana, the wife of King Radama I. While he was alive her cruel impulses had to be kept in subjection, because her husband was a kindly-disposed sovereign. But when he died, she seized the reins of power, thrusting aside the heiress whom the King had decreed should succeed him, on the pretense that so the gods, through the mouths of idols, had so ordered. She was described by the English historians of the missions as a woman given to drunkenness and savage passions, and controlled completely by the astrologers and sorcerers who filled the court at Antananarivo, the capital. We are compelled to take the evidence of these missionaries with reserve, for their reports were prepared for home consumption—and we know, from present-day revelations of the practices of Methodism in Italy, how large a part is played by fiction in missionary statistics and chronicles. The account of the severities adopted toward the London missionaries, when the determination to suppress the missions was taken by the Queen, must be read with caution. Even so ardent an anti-Catholic publication as the *North British Review* remarked, commenting on what was reported by the London Missionary Society as the situation in Madagascar (May, 1847), that the conduct of the Europeans in the country had been such as to draw down on them the wrath and vengeance of the natives: "Alas! how generally has this been the conduct of Europeans in their intercourse with barbarous nations! Treacherous, rapacious, cruel, licentious, they have produced against Christianity and its missionaries unconquerable prejudices, rancorous animosity." And again, after due introspection and honest heart searching: "With all the severity of those measures toward the natives, if we take into account the despotic and feudal character of the government (Malagasy) and the nature of the established religion, we shall be, perhaps, *surprised at their moderation,* and at the solicitude manifested to conduct them with due regard to what was right and just, according to the standard of rectitude in that part of the world. *Our own country was guilty of more savage persecution 300 years ago."* (The italics are our's, not his.)

We may appropriately add to this ingenuous confession of disingenuous attempts to excite sympathy by dwelling upon the shortcomings of a semi-savage people—and for the plain and avowed purpose of swelling the treasury of the richest missionary organization in the whole world—that when the persecuted missionaries gained the upper hand again they did not hesitate to excite the same spirit of savage cruelty in the natives toward the Catholic missionaries and their converts. Of this discreditable fact we shall adduce abundant evidence in the course of this imperfect survey.

Madagascar is a very large and compactly shaped island, situated on the eastern coast of Africa. Resembling in this respect the larger and not very remote island or continent which we call Australia, it shows a comparatively unbroken coast line, dotted with a few outlying islands, and hardly any at all on the Pacific side, for half its length; while the absence of gulfs or bays on the same side, for a great stretch of the coast, forms a curious feature in the map. Its extreme length, from Cape Amber, on the north, to Cape St. Mary, on the south, is about 975 miles; while its breadth, which does not vary exceedingly, at the widest part is approximately about one-third of the length. The island was known to the ancient geographers, and was described by Marco Polo. The island is as large in acreage as all the British Islands in Europe, while the population was estimated, half a century ago, as between four and five millions, but in 1900 it was estimated at between three and four millions only. The people are described in the earlier histories and sketches as industrious, intelligent and semi-civilized. They are of various races—Arab, Malay and Negro. The Negroes differ considerably from those of the African Continent, and they have not the wooly hair which characterizes that branch of the great black-skinned family. The Malayan is the predominant race. They are called Hovas, and they inhabit the upland and hilly portions of the country, while the Negroes are confined chiefly to the sea coast and low-lying country. The island is rich in minerals and cereals, forest trees, flowering shrubs and fruit trees, many of the latter producing food of the most varied and nutritious kinds. Immense forests cover large tracts of country in the interior, and the variety of wood they yield is unsurpassed. Orchids of immense size and beauty abound in the forests, and gigantic ferns and palms are also a prominent feature of the tropical landscape. A great number of medicinal shrubs are also found in Madagascar. Sugar, rice, cotton, sweet potatoes and several other crops are cultivated, while amongst the strange edibles which are served up to travelers are to be found grasshoppers and silk-worms! Hemp, silk, indigo, tobacco, gum, ebony, beeswax, honey and many other valuable products of the field and the forest are part of the store which Nature offers for the use of the human race, almost without the trouble of gathering or cultivating on their part, so exuberant is the soil and so royal the bounty of the gorgeous and lavish giver.

Possibly the best accounts of the varied riches of Madagascar are to be found in the works of the Rev. Mr. Ellis, head of the London missionaries. He spent several years in the country, and, being a man of a scientific turn and good education, he was enabled to present so tempting a picture of its natural wealth and commercial possibilities that it warmed the missionary-merchant heart, and gave a great impetus to the zeal of the philanthropists of Exeter Hall, London, England.

Lest it might be charged that in making the foregoing observations regarding the general character of British non-Catholic missionary enterprise, we shall summarize portions of the first chapter of the Rev. Mr. Ellis' book on his "Visits to Madagascar" (Bradley, Philadelphia, 1859)—viz.:

"It is only since our (the English) possession of Mauritius, and the subsequent treaty of friendship and alliance entered into between the late King Radama and the Governor of Mauritius (Sir Robert Farquhar) in 1817, that our countrymen have given much attention to the island or its inhabitants.

"In the treaty with Radama the English sought chiefly the abolition of the slave trade, and in order to compensate the King and his chiefs for the loss which this measure would entail upon them, and to secure their coöperation in rendering it effectual, an annual payment was made by the British Government to the King. This payment consisted partly of ammunition and arms, and men were sent to Madagascar to instruct the native soldiers in the use of firearms and in military tactics. To the arms and discipline thus supplied, and used with a wanton disregard of human life and human suffering happily unknown in warfare among civilized nations, are to be ascribed much of Radama's success in extending the dominion of the Hovas far beyond the central province of Ankova, its original boundary."

So that in order to put down one form of barbarism another was taught the natives, which they speedily turned to account in driving the missionaries of the government which taught it out of the kingdom, bag and baggage—a fact which showed that these semi-savages were by no means so dull as to be unable to distinguish the immense difference between precept and example in the messengers of a "superior" Christianity. As for the effects of the "deal" upon the slave trade, they must have been for many a year practically nil. The Mozambique Channel was the richest place in all the world for the Arab owners of the dhows which bore the human freight from Africa and Madagascar toward the Red Sea and the Mediterranean markets.

The Rev. Mr. Ellis dwells, in his work on Madagascar, on the results of the treaty between King Radama and the Governor of Mauritius as one of the great epoch-making transactions of this mundane sphere, inasmuch as it abolished the slave trade that had been carried on from Madagascar as the source of supply. Yet, with delightful unconsciousness he proceeds to describe, in a succeeding chapter, the universal prevalence in Madagascar of the very thing whose supposed extinction he had lauded as a blessing so great and uplifting as to offset the awful horrors attendant on the giving of firearms, gunpowder and military training to a savage people already notorious and execrated for their shocking disregard of human life and their fiendish appetite for blood and the horrors of human sacrifices, as great, it would seem, as that of the ancient Aztecs of Mexico. Forty years after the making of the treaty which was supposed to bring this great compensatory blessing Mr. Ellis saw and heard for himself how illusory was the hope held out. He saw slavery everywhere prevalent on the island, and he gives moving pictures of some of its inhuman practices and conditions; he tells of the Hovas going forth to battle with neighboring tribes and of their returning with trains of captives devoted to the slave market, by the hundred and by the thousand. He tells in another place of his having been entertained by a chief who, besides great wealth in gold and live stock, was the owner of one thousand slaves. He tells us that the treaty was observed by King Radama, but violated by General Hall, English Governor of Mauritius, who restored the slave traffic. How, then, could the treaty be justly described as "epoch-making?" He tells also of some humiliating scenes of drunkenness and rioting that followed in the train of public ceremonials he had witnessed, and of the establishment of stations for the sale of intoxicants to the already debased savages. This is the usual story of the advance of civilization. The rum comes after the gunpowder and the musket, to complete the work which the London brand of missionary begins. It began it in the days of French and English commercial rivalry, in the interests of the octopus East India Company; and now that an end came to the power of that huge agency for evil, in the sanguinary drama of the Indian Mutiny, the work is continued for the benefit of the whole commercial solidarity of Britain, from the Thames to the Yang-tse-Kiang.

The first practical fruits of the efforts of the London missionaries were the establishment of trade relations with England and the transference of several thousand young men from the soil of Madagascar to the decks of British warships to learn seamanship and navigation, so that they might become useful to the British as pilots and fighting men in Madagascar waters. More thousands were placed as apprentices under the English craftsmen whom the missionaries had brought over with them or followed after them on hearing of the prospects which the great rich tropical island offered to enterprising and ambitious British workmen.

In a little while there sprang up a pretty considerable foreign settlement at Tamatave, the principal port on the eastern coast. There had been an earlier settlement of French traders and shipping men from the neighboring island of Mauritius; and it was not long ere the inevitable conflict between native interests and those of the foreign settlers arose. The Malagasy Government wished to have the laws of Madagascar govern the foreign settlers; the latter, according to the usual pretensions of the European races, thought that difference in the hue of their skin entitled them to have a code of laws for their own government; and when the issue thus raised became serious, the traders appealed to the authority and armed strength of their respective home governments. The answer was the despatch of a joint French and British squadron to Madagascar waters, and the landing of a party to endeavor to arrange an amicable settlement of the questions in dispute. The attempt proved abortive; the negotiators returned to their ships, and the next thing the Malagasy people knew was that cannon were roaring along the coast and the town and port of Tamatave were being blown to atoms and the houses going up in flames all along the shore and far inland. Forces of marines and sailors were landed at the same time, and these made an attack on the fort, killing many natives in the course of the fight and wounding a great many more. Ultimately, however, they were repulsed and driven back to the ships—for the Hovas are gallant fighters—and they left thirteen of their number dead on the field. The heads of these the natives cut off and fixed on poles, as a warning to other possible intruders.

The effects of this brutal and stupid act of aggression were in the last degree disastrous—and more disastrous to the wicked powers who were responsible for it than to the people of the injured party, for the Government of Madagascar at once stopped all intercourse with the islands of Bourbon and Mauritius. At one blow all shipments of cattle and rice to these islands were cut off, and as a consequence great distress prevailed for several years in those remote and helpless dependencies. Moreover, a furious persecution of the Christians, Protestant and Catholic, was the cruel punishment visited on the innocent victims of official folly. All suspected of leanings toward Christianity, though not professors of it, were pounced upon and forced to undergo the punishment of the ordeal—generally the drinking of the Tanguena, or poison water. Death almost invariably followed the taking of the unsavory draught. Many Christians were burned to death, many more were flung from top of a high rock outside the capital, as in old Rome culprits were punished by being thrown from Tarpeian Rock; thousands of recusants were sold into slavery. The reign of terror lasted several years.

Ranavolana had a particular dislike of the English and their missionaries. She expelled them all from the country in 1835. Some of the French Catholic ones still held their ground despite her utmost efforts to expel or capture them. The Jesuits were not to be dismayed in the enterprise they had undertaken by any dangers. They made the island of Réunion, or Bourbon, their *point d'appui* for the Madagascar campaign. They established there a large industrial school, as well as a training school for teachers and a seminary for a native priesthood. They set up missions at various points on the coast of Madagascar. These were burned down again and again by the Hovas, but as soon as these enemies had departed from the scene of ruin the patient Jesuits were again on the spot, rebuilding and repairing the ravage. At last quiet came when Queen Ranavolana died, in 1861, and her son, Radama II., succeeded. Although not a Christian, the new sovereign was liberal, and he at once abolished all his mother's laws against Christianity and re-opened communication between the island and European nations. The London Missionary Societies were prompt to take advantage of the altered conditions, and their emissaries were received with great favor at Antananarivo, and soon found themselves in a position of great influence there. In like manner the Jesuits were received by the liberal monarch and his Queen, Rasoherina, and encouraged to resume their work for the redemption of the natives for civilization. But this did not suit the programme of the London missionaries. They were there with designs ulterior to the conquest of the island for Christianity. Their headquarters in the capital soon became the centre of political intrigue. Whether the King was the victim of this situation or not, no one knew, but shortly after his accession he was murdered, and the commander of the army, Rainivoninahitriony, became virtual ruler of the country as Prime Minister under Queen Rasoherina, whom he had married soon after her husband's murder. This fact, together with the circumstance that it was a number of chiefs under the influence of the English missionaries who had led the revolt which terminated in the death of Radama, discloses a remarkable resemblance between Madagascar ways and ancient Egyptian and present Oriental ones—in regard at least to palace intrigues. The British Government looked askance at the appearance of the French on the island, because the possession of such a strong position as Madagascar, on the Indian Ocean, menaced their power in India not a little.

At last the secret efforts of the missionaries were crowned with success. The British Government secured a treaty with Queen Rasoherina, and this forward step was immediately countered by a demand from the French one for an indemnity for losses to French traders, amounting to one million dollars, guaranteed under an earlier treaty made with the late King, Radama II. The demand was enforced by the French representative, and the levy enraged the Malagasy people so that the lives of French residents seemed to be in imminent danger. Hostility to the French was fanned artfully by the missionary agents, and so it came about that Catholicity and French governmental policy became in the native mind identical—a truly ironical outcome of a situation wherein the enemies of Catholicity in France were at the time in power there and had begun the movement for the expulsion of the religious orders, which has been so thoroughly finished in our own day. For a long time France had had a protectorate over the Madagascar coast, but never stretched the claim so as to clash with the government of the interior. It required great address and ingenuity on the part of the French representative to avert the peril of an uprising and massacre of French residents, consequent on the levy of the indemnity and the use to which the act had been put by the English missionary societies, and fortunately the danger blew over after a little while. The irony of the situation became more remarkable from the scrupulous abstention from politics which the Catholic missionaries in Madagascar had always been known to observe.

A crisis came in 1881, when the infidel French Government decreed the closing of the industrial school at Réunion and the expulsion of the Jesuits in all the French possessions. The closing of the school had been brought about by the machinations of an infidel who represented the island in the French Legislature. It was the signal for a persecution of the Catholics in Madagascar, instigated by the English missionaries. But the trickery had a very different outcome from that anticipated by the missionaries. It brought on a declaration of war on Madagascar by the French Government because of the high-handed proceedings of the Queen and her Ministers, prompted by the English emissaries, toward French residents.

The first step taken by Ranavolana's government, on receipt of the declaration of war, was to expel all the Catholic missionaries in the country. The converts, left thus without spiritual guidance, behaved as a whole remarkably well. For the most part they assembled at their places of worship at the usual time, and were not to be intimidated even by threats of massacre. At one time the pagans went so far as to train artillery on the Cathedral, but the worshipers held their ground undismayed, and the design to blow them to pieces was, for some unknown reason, abandoned by those who had conceived it, or else had never really existed and the show of preparation been only intended to overawe the Catholics and cause them to fall away.

The war dragged on for nearly three years, but without any decisive move on either side, beyond the occupation of the ports of Tamatave and Majunga by the French. The Queen tried to effect an alliance, first with England, then with Germany, but fruitlessly. She died in 1884, and was succeeded by a female relative, who took the same name and married the Prime Minister. Peace was made with France in the following year, the conditions being that Madagascar was to come under French control, so far as its foreign relations were concerned, and pay an indemnity of two million francs for damages sustained by French citizens during the war. By the terms of the treaty perfect freedom for the teaching of the Catholic religion was guaranteed—a somewhat paradoxical condition to be insisted on by a government which was engaged at home in curtailing the freedom for which it was stipulating abroad. Similar inconsistencies have arisen since that time, in the dealings of the French Government with outside powers with regard to French religious settlements in the countries involved, especially in Mahometan countries. But the French are a peculiar people, in this regard. They seem to enjoy the humor of a paradox, even when it turns the laugh on themselves.

Thus ended all the plotting of the English missionaries. It was they who had incited the savage Queen to begin the persecutions which had drawn down upon the country the vengeance of the French Government, and by which it had now forfeited its independence of action. The English Government was furious, but it was powerless to resent the action of France, since it was its own allies and emissaries that had brought the calamity (as they regarded it) about. All it could do was to gain from France an assent to a recognition of Britain's suzerainty over the Sultanate of Zanzibar, which had been forcibly assumed on pretense of putting down the slave trade. On obtaining this concession from the French the government of Lord Salisbury withdrew all opposition to the Madagascar policy of the republic. This arrangement left the missionary companies the same freedom of action as was accorded the French missions. As to the Madagascan Government, it has since occupied a curious position. It adopted a Christianity without any definite formula and made it a State religion, but the great mass of the people held aloof and clung to the old paganism of their forefathers—a paganism marked by features most loathsome and cruel and immoralities most shocking. An institution called the tribal dance is described as being more bestial than that of any other pagan people, being accompanied by orgies of debauchery and drunkenness of the most frightful character, and which are carried on in full view of thousands of spectators. Even the Malagashes who become converts to Christianity are often very unstable and volatile in character. In this they seem to resemble the Negro races with which we are familiar here, whose religion is largely emotional and whose passions are almost uncontrollable. Under the most favorable conditions the elevation of such a population must be a matter of slow and patient effort.

The Hova Government showed no great anxiety to carry out the terms of the treaty of 1885, particularly in regard to a clause providing for a disarmament of the native troops. The French Government, on being informed of the deceptive character of its proceedings and the covert preparations it had been making for a rupture of the treaty, under the secret promptings of English missionaries, sent over an envoy, M. Larrony, in October, 1892, to ascertain the truth as to the situation. He found that the treaty had not been observed, and that the English party was again in full control. The French Catholic missions were being ruthlessly persecuted. These missions had their headquarters in four different centres—first, in Antananarivo and Imerina, with thirty fathers; second, Fianaraulsoa, with ten fathers, who had gathered in their schools more children than all the English ones combined; third, Tamatave, with three fathers; and fourth, Fort Dauphin, which was beginning to promise great results in the future. It was this progress which had aroused the envy and the ire of the English missionaries. There were seventy-five missionary priests in the island, eighteen lay Brothers and sixteen Christian Brothers, and of Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, twenty-seven. There were one college and nine normal schools, eighty-three churches and 277 chapels, with 443 "posts" (stations). There were 136,175 Catholics and catechumens. The missions had established a colony for lepers, a great printing house and an observatory. There had been during the year preceding the new rupture nearly four thousand baptisms of adults and children. These things were a cause of great concern to the London gentlemen. In fancy they beheld the whole island going over rapidly to the hated religion of "Rome," and so they spared no effort to bring about a situation which would change the whole movement into one toward "England." They were successful in bringing about a change—but it turned out to be one for the worse for the contrivers. They lost in the game, in the final outcome.

The French Government despatched a formidable expedition to Madagascar. It suffered many disasters by sea and land, owing to mismanagement and inefficiency in preparation, having been something like a repetition of the dismal story of bungling on the English side at the outbreak of the Crimean War. The medical service was lamentably inefficient and inadequate, and in consequence many of the troops lost their lives or became disabled during the long and trying voyage; and when the remnant was at last put on *terra firma* many more went down before the deadly diseases of a tropical climate and the exhausting trials of a long march in a country swarming with wild beasts and enemies hardly less dangerous than the *ferae naturae,* as well as poisonous reptiles and impure water. By a desperate *coup de main* General Duchesne, commander of the expedition, succeeded in getting a column of 2,000 men to make a forced march of more than 200 kilometres and assault the capital. More than 25,000 Hova soldiers defended the position, while the inhabitants numbered more than 60,000. But the onslaught of the desperate Frenchmen was irresistible, and soon the white flag proclaimed the downfall of Hova-cum-British rule in Madagascar.

The Catholic missionaries quickly set to work to recuperate their strength when the clouds of war disappeared. But with the arrival of a new commander, General Gallieni, a change altogether unexpected came over the situation. The Missions Evangéliques de Paris had got the government to assent to the despatch of French Protestant missionaries to help their English confreres in opposing Catholic missionary effort, and on their arrival an alliance was formally entered into between the several heads of the French, English and Norwegian societies in Madagascar, laying down zones of work for each body in the island, and allotting a certain portion to the unclassified sub-section known as Independents. The new "holy alliance" lost no time in arranging plans to embarrass the Catholic missions in every way possible, and its efforts were aided to a large extent by the forces of Freemasonry, which by that time had obtained a footing of some strength in the island. Still the Catholic forces did not suffer much defection. The churches which had been levelled or injured during the war were quickly rebuilt or repaired and the schools re-opened and filled with scholars, without loss of time. The Malagasy Catholics came to the aid of the missionaries with a generosity altogether unwonted—for ordinarily they are an avaricious people. But the lack of priests and teaching Brothers was for long a lamentable drawback, until the creation of the Vicariate Apostolic of North Madagascar and its juncture with the Prefecture of the Smaller Isles, which took place in July, 1898. The Fathers of the Holy Ghost were given charge of the new Vicariate, and Monsignor Cabel was the first titulary dignitary. A great impetus to Catholic work was the immediate result of the wise change. Still the action of the clergy was at times much hampered by the military and maritime authorities, but the obstacles then encountered were trifling as compared with what was to follow when the war on the Church began in France. When this was inaugurated, the Protestant press generally took up an attitude of approval, since the Catholic Church and Catholic institutions were the first to feel the breath of the coming cyclone. Soon, however, it became apparent that it was not aimed exclusively at the Catholic Church, and then the tone of the press underwent a very marked alteration. Separation between Church and State meant the same thing to French Protestants as to French Catholics; and the colonies were placed in the same category as the mother country and treated in much the same way, so far as the application of the new laws was concerned. Consternation seized upon the Protestant missionary societies, which had long lorded it over the Catholic ones in Madagascar by reason of their influence over successive rulers and the governing class. There is no longer freedom to assemble for public worship unless by permission; no longer freedom to erect houses for worship; permission to build must be asked for, and when requested is frequently denied. Churches built under the old *régime* are being closed, on the ground that they were built without permission; others which have fallen into dilapidation are being shut up. The same rule is impartially applied, whether the petitioners and complainants be Catholics or Protestants. Bitter murmurings are heard, as a consequence, from the Protestant press; as for the Catholics, they seem to be resigned to the situation. They are the children and heirs of suffering, and know how to bow before the storm, trusting in Divine Providence to bring about a better era in His own good time.

There is a movement on foot to endeavor to arouse the United States Government to remonstrate with that of France as to the attitude of the Governor of Madagascar. It is in the last degree unlikely that any complaint based on the objection that the Governor is an atheist and a Socialist, and an enemy to the Christian religion, as charged in the Protestant press, would receive any attention from the present French Cabinet, for any attitude but one of indifference would be out of harmony with the affiliations and hustings pledges of the Ministry. The Governor has been asked to give his side of the question as to conditions in Madagascar. Lately he was approached by the president of the Protestant Missionary Society with a request for redress of the grievances complained of, and he said in reply: "I ask myself with what right you come to me with this request? On the ground of what statute, with what mandate, do you place yourself between a troop of natives and their government?" To a representative of the *Matin* the Governor gave an exposition of the reasons why he has adopted such an attitude toward the missionaries—a very curious example of logic it must appear when considered in the light of the events now transpiring in France, where no such conditions prevail as in the case of Madagascar. He said: "The struggle against Protestantism has lost its sharpness; it concerns far less the question of education than the other, 'What attitude should the Government assume towards religious worship?' We are confronted with a question of political significance; whether Madagascar shall belong to France or to the missionaries. The inhabitant of Madagascar has no religious conceptions. He joins the mission only to avoid the Government. In order to make a Frenchman of him you must force him to break with the priests and missionaries and bring him in close touch with the French officials. I have tried to reach this object by restricting the propaganda of the priests and missionaries. Among the two hundred missionaries there are only fifty Frenchmen, the rest are Englishmen and Norsemen. This shows plainly enough the spirit of this propaganda; moreover these people are very restless."

As the Catholic missionaries are all Frenchmen, it might seem to be a task of supererogation to try to make them Gauls. Moreover, it is difficult to conceive how Madagascar Hovas can be transformed into Frenchmen, unless by claiming that all Frenchmen now are pagans like the majority of Hovas, and a common bond of hatred of Christianity nullifies the distinctions of nativity. However the case be reasoned out, it must have a chastening effect on those former persecutors of Catholics in Madagascar to have the searing irons of persecution applied now to their own corporeality for a season.

When one looks beneath the surface of professions and analyses the admissions made by many of those who persuade themselves and others that they have no motives but autruistic ones in setting forth to bring the word of salvation to heathen peoples and worse than heathen Catholics, it will often be found that the process of selfdeception is so simple as to be amazing to reasoners who follow the lines of plain logic. A single illustration taken from the works of the Rev. William Ellis, the principal leader in the London missionary movement in Madagascar, will suffice to show the animus of the great philanthropists. It is taken from a work called "Three Visits to Madagascar" (Bradley, Philadelphia, 1859), p. 318-19. The author is telling of an interview with the Prince Royal:

"The Prince inquired with much earnestness whether I knew if there was any truth in the reports of an intended invasion of Madagascar by the French, of which he said there were rumors at that time in the capital. I told him I had seen something about such a thing in the public journals of Europe, but that they were in all probability only reports, and without foundation; as I did not think it likely that the French Government would send troops to fight against them, and that I was sure the English cherished toward them only friendly feelings. I told him there were many statements in the newspapers in Europe, which we who were living there did not know whether to believe or not, and for which in reality there was sometimes no real foundation; adducing as an instance that I had read in a newspaper in England that he himself had become a Roman Catholic, and that an agent from himself had actually been in Rome negotiating for Roman Catholic priests to be sent to his country. He declared there was no truth in any such statement; but added, that there was a Roman Catholic priest at the capital who had tried to persuade him to become a Roman Catholic, and had given to the Princess, his wife, a crucifix, and to himself a silver medal, stating to them that if they wore these on their breasts, and put confidence in the Virgin Mary, the Princess would become a mother. 'But,' he added, 'it has not proved true; my wife has no child.' He then opened his vest, and showed me the silver medal suspended from his neck by a silken cord. On one side was the letter M, with the cross interwoven, and surrounded by stars; on the other side was a figure of the Virgin in relief, standing with outstretched arms, and around the figure were these words: *'O Marie! conçue sans péché! priez pour nous qui avons recours à vous.'* At the bottom was the date 1830. The Prince said he had no wish to become a Roman Catholic; but I could not help reflecting that, had it so occurred that the Princess, after wearing the crucifix, had become a mother, this might have been ascribed to the influence of the symbol, or the efficacy of the Virgin's intercession; and thus a very different effect might have been produced on their own minds, and on those of many of the people."

Those English missionaries constantly told the natives that Catholics were idolators, just like themselves, and that they worshiped the Blessed Virgin. Yet the only evidence that such was the case was such as was furnished by this pathetic invocation of the help of our Blessed Lady inscribed on the medal. And it was plainly the wish of the Rev. Mr. Ellis that the petition might not, in this case, be granted and the divinely-planted maternal desire on the part of the Queen might be disappointed, all in order that no token of the efficacy of Catholic prayer might be given, to thwart the schemes of the London Missionary Society! Could the force of human malice any further go?

Does not this story recall the incident of Elcana and his barren wife, and the prayer she made to have the reproach taken from her? The prophet Heli deemed her drunk because he saw her lips moving in prayer and yet no sound issued from them. But when she piteously told him the cause of her sorrow, Heli did not mock her or inwardly hope that her petition might not be granted, but prayed that God would be pleased to make her fruitful, as a true prophet and servant of God ought to do. And the son who was given in answer to her prayer was by Anna and Elcana vowed unto God to be His servant, and he became in time the great prophet Samuel. How very different from the Jewish prophet Heli was the British prophet Ellis! What an example of the English missionary idea of Christian charity do we find him giving over his own signature!

Despite persecution, Catholicism continues to make steady progress in Madagascar. From a report by the Rev. Hilarion Gill, in *The Catholic Mind,* of February this year, we gain the following information as to the state of the mission in the island:

"After fruitless attempts in former centuries, and equally vain efforts between 1830 and 1861, our missioners finally succeeded in establishing themselves there, in the person of French Jesuits, who had their share of success in spite of the hindrances put in their way by Protestantism, which was at the time the religion of the State in Madagascar. By 1882 the mission numbered 80,000 souls, including converts and catechumens. To-day, after having ceded the northern district to the Congregation of the Holy Ghost and the southern to the Lazarists, the Jesuit mission has 174,533 Catholics and 258,000 catechumens, and 1,253 schools with 62,961 pupils. In the vicariate which the mission constitutes there are two Bishops, 183 priests, 72 lay Brothers, 94 nuns and 1,604 school teachers. The missionaries reside in certain central stations, whence they go forth to preach the word and to give special instructions to the catechumens and children preparing for first Communion. At the head of each minor station is placed a catechist who teaches the children, leads in the prayers recited in common, and forms with some of the principal personages a sort of patriarchal council for the village.

The catechists, who are commonly schoolmasters as well, are trained with great care by the missionaries. As a help towards keeping up the spirit of their training, they pay a monthly visit to the nearest central station, usually on the first Friday, receive the sacraments and consult with the fathers. Once a year they make the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius."

Nor are the Catholic converts milk and water ones, or only veneered with religion. We have some evidences of their general quality in the reports of the fathers who labor in the field. One of these, the Rev. Father Castets, S. J., who is in Central Madagascar, wrote in the *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* for February, 1908:

"One must not be too eager to multiply conversions. The field is here, but it must be cultivated before it can be extended. We must guard against having merely mediocre Christians. It is necessary to confirm in the faith the families already won to Catholicism and insure this heritage of truth to their children.

"Formerly the majority of the natives followed, without knowing why, the religion of their masters. Now the sects are disappearing. To give but one example—at Ambohimalaza, the centre of my district, of the four thousand inhabitants who formerly filled three Protestant churches there are now hardly a hundred people who meet in one church and ten or twelve others in the second. The third has been opened only once to receive the relatives of the pupils of a school directed by a Swiss deaconess of the French (Huguenot) Mission.

"This assembly in the largest of the three churches was not a prayer meeting, but a gathering brought about to insure the pay of the teachers. At our chapel we have three hundred and sixty baptized Catholics and six hundred adherents who declare they belong to us. Among these a number have set to work resolutely to study the Catholic doctrine. The others content themselves with coming to us and repeating *mbola hianatra,* 'I will study some time in the futrue.'

"Where are the three thousand inhabitants of Ambohimalaza who are neither Catholics nor Protestants? They have fallen back into paganism, and have resumed their old heathen practices.

"Though at each station there are some indifferent Christians, whose carelessness is often the result of ignorance, others are well instructed and faithful to the practices of piety and to the frequentation of the sacraments.

"Thus it is that always on the first Friday of the month I number more than one hundred communions of people who come, sometimes, from great distances. Frequently they arrive the evening before, having walked about twenty miles.

"The next morning after communion they set out on their return journey. Their perseverance is most edifying, and must be very pleasing to God.

"In a month from now we are to furnish Bishop Cazet with a report of our work. Already the number of communions during the year exceeds five thousand. There are among these people many beautiful souls, who struggle against imperfection with a constancy for which I bless Our Lord.

"Some members of my congregation communicate daily and on Sundays travel after me to the different stations in order that they may not be deprived of the Holy Eucharist. The apostolate, notwithstanding its bodily fatigues and hardships, assuredly often affords the soul great consolation. We would fain have Christians perfect in a day and we are occasionally a little discouraged at the inconstancy of a few. But we must not forget that Catholicity is a new religion in this land of Madagascar and that our Christians are surrounded by many dangers.

"The generosity of these people is really surprising. Recently I happened to remark that the roof of the church of Anjeva was badly in need of repair. The following Sunday every one had sold a certain number of chickens and ducks and the collection amounted to ninety-five dollars. Yet forty-seven baptized Christians had died of the fever during the year in this small settlement and the survivors were dragging out a miserable convalescence. I thanked them for their liberality, and they replied that they were well pleased thus to *lend* something to God."

The Rev. Father Castel, S. J., writes also from another part of the same island, as follows:

"Ikongo is a district at a considerable distance from Betsileo mission. Situated in the southeastern part of Fianarantsoa, on the wooded border of the great plain of Central Madagascar, it is difficult of access, and the Tanales, who inhabit this region at the present day, were not evangelized until 1906. At that time Peter Lépa, one of the natives, was baptized. Through his zeal a little Christian congregation has been founded among these people.

"Thanks be to God, not one of the young men and young women who received into their hearts the good seed sown there by a Madagascan neophyte has turned back to paganism.

"The Tanale Catholic congregation founded, one may say, without a missionary priest, augmented and kept up without a missionary, appears a miracle of grace. The instance is more surprising because this is a congregation of young people; its leader being a youth, only seventeen or eighteen years old.

"Often placed in positions calling for the exercise of extraordinary tact as well as judgment, forced to consider, on the one hand, the authority of the French officials on the island, and on the other, the native government, Peter Lépa has respected both. His conduct has remained irreproachable. The spirit of faith, love of God, zeal for the salvation of souls, surely these traits are the foundation of solid virtue. We find them in this young catechist to a marked degree.

"But what is the present state of affairs at Ikongo? What will become of this Catholicity so marvelously implanted, of this piety without divine worship and the sacraments? The young Christians of the forest are, at present, as destitute of spiritual aids as in the beginning. Recently a fire swept through Ikongo, destroying many houses of the village and, among them, the cabin used as a chapel. Since then the French Government has refused permission to the young Catholics to build even a hut of reeds and straw wherein to assemble.

"Despite these misfortunes and difficulties, however, the sacred spark of the true faith burns brightly amid this little band of neophytes, and is ready to glow into a flame, when the district can be more widely evangelized.

"The catechumens and neophytes daily gather around their young leader, assemble for devotions in the cabin of one of them, and strive, as far as possible, to keep the Sundays and festivals of the Church as days of prayer."

A still more remarkable report is that given by the Rev. Father Rouffiac, another member of the zealous Jesuit band, in the *Annals* for August of last year. We give only a portion of it here, but this will suffice to show the quality of the Catholic converts in Madagascar:

"From the beginning of their labors in this apostolic field, the missionaries of Madagascar have recognized the importance of Holy Communion for the sanctification of their neophytes, and that no other devotion can so effectually accomplish this object. The first Friday of each month is observed throughout the mission with almost as much solemnity as Sunday.

"On the first Friday all the Catholics of the village where the missionary resides assist at the Sacrifice of the Mass, and many approach the Holy Table. Many others come to the services from the neighboring villages and sometimes travel long distances in order to be present.

"This monthly communion does not satisfy the missionaries, however; they wish their penitents to communicate oftener, and labor for this end. To give an idea of the growth of this pious practice we quote the figures of the mission report:

"In 1897 there were 70,000 communions; in 1904 the number had increased to 218,000; in 1908 there were 417,000. The custom is now, therefore, well established.

"In order to consider more in detail the spiritual benefits achieved by this salutary devotion, we will observe the results obtained in a locality particularly well known to the present writer—namely, Saint Michael's School, Amparibé.

"The students of this institution are intended to become models of the Christian life for their compatriots, whether they return to their native villages as teachers or follow the careers of interpreters, planters or merchants.

"Especial care is, therefore, given to their training. Every day, in all the grades, there is a class of religious instruction, lasting three-quarters of an hour. After spending five or six years in this establishment, a young man may truly be considered well informed with regard to the teaching and practices of the faith.

"To this education the Holy Eucharist adds a new strength and enlightenment. In 1903 or 1904 the practice of frequent communion was inaugurated at Saint Michael's. Previously, the most devout among the students contented themselves with the weekly or Sunday communion. Then they were told that those who wished might also approach the Holy Table during the week.

"The most fervent availed themselves of the privilege. Others sometimes permitted a fortnight, three weeks or even a month to elapse between their communions.

"After the publication of the decree of His Holiness Pope Pius X., exhorting the faithful to have recourse to frequent communion, the document was explained to the students. The devout were encouraged to follow the counsel of the Holy Father in order to preserve and increase their fervor; the less pious and more difficult of restraint, in order that they might become more docile and devout. All were, however, left free to follow the dictates of grace in their hearts.

"A certain number of the students began to receive Holy Communion daily. The greater number approached the altar several times a week. Not one let more than a week pass without communicating.

"If the saint of the day was one whose life was familiar to them, or was the patron of one of the missionaries, almost all the students received Communion.

"On these mornings the teacher in surveillance during the early study hour found the study hall deserted. Instead of ninety or ninety-five students he found before him ten or twelve, and these were, probably, youths not yet baptized, or small boys who had not yet made their first Communion.

"Moreover, the students prepare for the reception of the Blessed Sacrament with much care and purity of conscience. Some are dispensed from confessing, without necessity, before each Communion, but few avail themselves of this permission. The majority approach the Sacrament of Penance before every Communion."

Protestantism in Madagascar was for many years the religion of the State, and a persecuting one at that, like its maternal source in Britain, is now dwindling away and perishing of inanition. It calls on the Governments of Great Britain and the United States to come to its aid. The Catholics call upon no earthly help. They look, as they always have done, to Him who is watching over what is going on in Madagascar, as in France, and who will not fail in time to answer the prayers of His own people.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

JOHN BANNISTER TABB, POET.

IN modern times the death of no poet has called forth the universal attention which for the last few months has been focused upon the late John Bannister Tabb. Living he was accorded a place among the best of contemporaneous poets. But dead—when his voice was forever stilled, when the last sweet note had trilled from his liquid throat—the literary world suddenly realized its loss, and the critics dipped their pens in tears and unanimously placed him in the loftiest choir of lyric singers in the English language—into the small and select circle wherein sit Shelley, Coleridge, Keats and Poe.

Their noonday never knows
  What names immortal are:
'Tis night alone that shows
  How star surpasseth star.

This quatrain exemplifies his own life. His "noonday" little dreamed that in it walked the most beloved child of the Muses in the unpoetic days of the early twentieth century. But when he was gone, when "night" came, his glorious scintillations were missing, and then the truth was known. Yet "the song-bird, not the song, is hid," and down through the halls of years it will continue to reëcho, charming all who care to listen to its simple sweetness.

Tabb's claims to preëminence as a poet are many. To enumerate and exemplify them all is not our intention. We will note but a few and let them speak for themselves. His foremost and most striking attribute is originality. Originality in poetry is creation. Every man at some time or other feels sweeping upon his soul a flood of emotion which thrills his very being, but which he is unable to express. The ability to that is the prerogative of the poet. Poetic feeling is common to all; poetic expression, the gift of the few. Upon the manner of expression depends the ultimate worth of a poet. He may imitate, he may improve upon a model, or he may spontaneously burst forth into a rhapsody whose exemplar exists only in his own imagination. This last is creation, and no one will gainsay that it is the highest form of poetic composition. It is the direct result of genius and inspiration, and carries with it a tone which is lacking in the work produced under other conditions. Every line from Tabb's pen bears this mark of originality. Nowhere are we conscious that he is merely saying or reëchoing something which we have read before. His subjects may be old. They are—as old as nature herself. But his treatment is original; the message he draws from them is new. The more familiar the reader is with English poetry, the more evident will this qualitty be.

He is a master colorist, knowing full well the secret of every combination which will better bring out what he is trying to express. Just as color mastery marks the great artist, so it stamps the great poet. The use of adjectives and explanatory phrases are the principal colors which lend themselves to the poet. Tabb realized the value of them, and to his mastery of them is due his wonderful power of crystallization. He said more in four lines than many other poets said in four times as many. He not only said more, but said it more beautifully, more perfectly. Like Shakespeare, one word cannot be disturbed without the beauty of the entire structure being defaced.

Being a musician, he understood the inseparable bond between music and poetry, and never overlooked its importance. His ear, trained to musical cadence, was ever alert to the slightest whispering of nature, which he immediately took in and made his own. Hence his verses sway and dance in perfect measure like the fabled nymphs of antiquity. In his poems he has voiced the twittering of skylarks, the sighing of echoes, the rippling of brooklets, the whispering of boughs and the murmuring of zephyrs in a most exquisite manner. Listen to the melody in the following lines from "The Dews:"

We drip through the night from the starlids bright
  On the sleeping flowers,
And deep in their breast is our perfumed rest
  Through the darkened hours:
But again with the day we are up and away
  With our stolen dyes,
To paint all the shrouds of the drifting clouds
  In the eastern skies.

Through the fields of fancy he wandered with careless abandon. Into the haunts of bird and flower and brooklet he quietly stole and entered into close communion with the beauties of the visible world. Everything spoke to him, and he was ever ready to listen. Thus he becomes the interpreter of the things that pass the ken of the ordinary eye. His vision penetrates the thin veil which hides the "things unseen," and he gives the "exquisite expression of exquisite impressions." He lives in the ideal world so near and yet so far from our actual workaday world. For him sunbeams transform dewdrops into sparkling diamonds, and the spray of brooks is fairy kisses thrown to bashful flowers by sportive water-imps. Up the ladder of argent moonbeams he climbs to the meadows of space and roves among the "forget-me-nots" of the angels. He solves the magic of moonbeams, the mystery of starlight and holds familiar converse with the clouds, and when the night is spent, looking toward the reddening east, he cries out at "Dawn-Burst:"

Lo, now the dead volcano, Night,
  In silence cold,
Throbs; and the prisoned lava, long controlled,
  Bursts forth in moulten gold—
A torrent mightier far than rolled
  From Ætna or Vesuvius of old,
Or ever prophet, on the sacred height
  Of song, foretold.

Back to the earth he comes and sports with the lark, the robin, the mocking-bird, the violet, the water lily and the rose. He loves them all, but his love does not lose itself in nature-worship. He never runs against the hidden rocks of Pantheism, upon which so many singers have been wrecked. No; he sees God in all things and hears the glorious anthem the material world forever raises to its Creator:

I see Thee in the distant blue;
But in the Violet's dell of dew,
Behold, I *breathe* and *touch* Thee, too.

He remembers that here we have no lasting city, but as pilgrims are journeying to another land foreshadowed by the beauty of the flowers:

Like stars that in the waves below,
With heaven's reflected splendor glow,
The flowers in all their beauty bright
Are shadows of a fairer light.

To make a brief examination of his works we will divide them into three classes—quatrains, lyrics and sonnets. In all classes we wish to emphasize the clarity of thought, the witchery of expression and the delicacy of touch. Brevity, too, is one of their noteworthy features, for Tabb never aspired to long flights of song, but, like the lark, was content to sing a short, sweet lay, to outpour the rhapsody of his soul in a few melodious bars, and then to lapse into silence. Some have objected to the extreme brevity of his compositions. But they who do so have but a superficial idea of his work. For did they examine carefully the poems they consider too short, they would find in them much more than is revealed by desultory reading. Take, for example, the famous couplet:

All men the painter, Youth, engage;
And some the famous sculptor, Age.

Who will deny the world of meaning held within these two lines or complain because the thought was not stretched out into more verses? To such objectors the poet himself makes answer, for in "To a Songster" we read that it was his ambition:

O little bird, I'd be
A poet like to thee,
Singing my native song—
Brief to the ear, but long
To love and memory.

And all who have read his poems know how well he has succeeded in following his ideal.

Tabb's mastery of the quatrain is his crowning glory. No matter what place among the great lyric poets he is eventually assigned, it must be conceded that he is surpassed by no writer in the language in the richness, the beauty and the strength of his quatrains. The power of condensation evidenced in them is marvelous. They are thoughts crystallized, so that when the light of the reader's intellect plays upon them they refract and scintillate in a thousand different ways. One never wearies of them. Some new beauty is found, some secret thought hitherto hidden is revealed at every reading. Woven into them are the dyes of the rainbow, the iridescent hues of the butterfly's wing, the shimmer of star-gleam, the foam of billows, the solemnity of silence, the sternness of philosophy and the consolation of religion. He is fond of the paradox and frequently uses it with telling effect. To select some of his quatrains to exemplify his artistic excellence is like trying to pick the most perfect specimens from a casket of glittering diamonds. The task is almost hopeless, for we hesitate in the presence of absolute beauty. Yet we offer the following:

MOUNT EVEREST.

As in the furnace fared the holy feet,
  Unblemished by the seven-fold fervor, so
Nearest the sun, cold-whitening in the heat,
  Is thine eternal chastity of snow.

BETRAYAL.

"Whom I shall kiss," I heard a sunbeam say,
"Take him and lead away."
Then, with the traitor's salutation, "Hail!"
He kissed the dawn-star pale.

TWILIGHT.

Like Ruth, she follows where the reaper, Day,
Lets fall the slender shadows in her way;
Then—winnowing the darkness—home again,
She counts her golden grain.

WOMAN.

Shall she come down and on our level stand?
  Nay; God forbid it! May a mother's eyes—
Love's earliest home, the heaven of Babyland—
  Forever bend above us as we rise.

SLEEP.

What art thou, balmy sleep,
Foam from the fragrant deep
Of silence, hither blown
From the hushed waves of tone?

FANCY.

A boat unmoored, wherein a dreamer lies,
  The slumberous waves low-lisping of a land
Where love, forever with unclouded eyes,
  Goes, wed with wondering music, hand in hand.

THE POSTULANT.

In ashes from the wasted fires of noon,
  Aweary of the light,
Comes Evening, a tearful novice, soon
  To take the veil of Night.

HOLY GROUND.

Pause where apart the fallen sparrow lies,
  And lightly tread;
For there the pity of a Father's eyes
  Enshrines the dead.

WHISPER.

Close cleaving unto Silence, unto Sound
  She ventures as a timorous child from land,
Still glancing, at each wary step, around,
  Lest suddenly she lose her sister's hand.

With these selections from the quatrains we leave them and pass to the lyrics. Here we will sub-divide to facilitate consideration, classifying them as major and minor lyrics. Among the former we will include all the poems which represent his longest and most sustained flights in song, and among the latter the little gems which come between the quatrains and major lyrics. The same characteristics which mark his quatrains are to great extent found in the minor lyrics. Delicacy, condensation and vivid expression are ever prominent, coupled with a tripping and harmonious metrical arrangement. They are beautiful word pictures, filled with exquisite imagery, some of them woven of such gossamer texture that they glisten like spiders' webs in the sun. Every little thing he comes in contact with he beautifies and crystallizes. The flimsiness of the mist at dawn he has thus incorporated into the lines of "The Mist:"

Eurydice eludes the dark
To follow Orpheus, the lark
  That leads her to the dawn
With rhapsodies of star delight,
Till, looking backward in his flight,
  He finds that she is gone.

The destruction of the dream world wherein love fain would dwell is told in "Life's Ramah:"

Day after day
  The Herod Morn
Of dreams doth slay
  The latest born;
And Love, like Rachel o'er her dead,
Will not again be comforted.

Here we have a striking example of Tabb's power in the use of the explanatory word. Is there a word in the language which could better qualify "Morn" than "Herod," or explain "Love" than "Rachel?"

Who is there that in early spring when listening intently to the choir of frogs chanting their nocturnal hymns has not been impressed by the melancholy tone of their limpid, monotonous notes? Are there not many who have experienced what Tabb thus interprets in "Meadow Frogs:"

Ere yet the earliest warbler wakes,
Of coming spring to tell,
From every marsh a chorus breaks—
A choir invisible—
As though the blossoms underground
A breath of utterance had found.

Whence comes the liquid melody?
The summer clouds can bring
No fresher music from the sky
Than here the marshes sing.
Methinks the mists about to rise
Are chanting their rain prophecies.

The triumph and defeat of Death furnish the thought clothed in the lines of "Foiled:"

Ah, Death, thou art a lover,
  And with thy rival, Life,
For proud possession of her
  Didst wage perpetual strife,
Till Fate adjudged thee victory;
But Life's eternal spoil is she.

In "Conscience," that intangible something which makes up the better part of us, he robes sound philosophy in the beautiful garment of poesy:

I am that Tamerlane,
  The scourge of God;
With me alone remain
  The sword and rod
Wherewith in wrath throughout His world-domain
Doth Love avenging reign.

I am that Joseph, bound
  And sold in vain;
From dungeon darkness found
  To rise again,
At God's right hand, whate'er of good redound,
His sole vice-regent crowned.

From the depth and solidity of thought as expressed in the foregoing poem we turn to the delicately wrought lines of "A Legacy," in which the poet converses with a cloud. The sudden transition from the opposed poles of thought as evidenced in these two poems show Tabb's remarkable versatility:

Do you remember, little cloud,
  This morning, when you lay
A mist along the river, what
  The waters had to say?

And how the many colored flowers
  That on the margin grew
All promised when the day was done
  To leave their tints to you?

Among the major lyrics "The Cloud," "The Swallow," "Echoes" and "To a Wood-Robin" are preëminent. In conception and execution the work of no American poet approaches these lyrics. They are the poems which gain for Tabb admission into the exclusive circle wherein are Keats and Shelley. For they rival the best poems of these acknowledged masters. In "Echoes" he has caught the wistful sadness of the sighing phantoms and in tremulous verses bequeathed it to us.

Hark! the wavy chorus,
  Faint and far away,
Like a dream returning
  In the light of day—
Too fond to flee, alas! too timorous to stay.

Pausing, still they linger,
  As in love's delay,
With sybillic omen
  Seeming thus to say:
"Of all the vanished past, we Echoes only stay."

In "Swallow,"

. . . sweet child of spring:
  A slanting arrow sent
From yon fair-tinted bow,
  In promise bent,

the rippling music of the lines is like the twittering of the bird whose flight it portrays. The sentiment of the closing stanza is exceptionally sweet and calm:

For day is done,
  And, cloyed of long delight,
Like me, thou welcomest
  The sober night;
Like me, aweary, sinkest on the breast
That woos all nature to her silent rest.

The poet, contemplating the evanescent beauty of the cloud drifting aimlessly through the ocean of the sky, thus soliloquizes in "The Cloud:"

Far on the brink of day
  Thou standest as the herald of the dawn,
Where fades the night's last flickering spark away
  Ere the first dewdrop's gone.

. . . .

And when the evening dies
  Still to the fringed vesture clings the light;

The last sad glimmer of her tearful eyes
  On the dark verge of night.

So, soon thy glories wane.
  Thou, too, must mourn the rose of morning shed;
Cold creeps the fatal shadow o'er thy train,
  And settles on thy head.

And then, moralizing from the fate of the cloud, the poet would have us learn the great truth:

Thou, like the cloud, my soul,
  Dost in thyself of beauty naught possess;
Devoid the light of heaven, a vapor foul,
  The veil of nothingness.

There is a joyousness in "To a Wood-Robin" which is charged with the very breath of spring. When we read this poem we distinctly hear the piping of the robin as he trills his welcome to the awakening woodlands. The song of the bird awakens the poetic spirit of the poet, and in his inspiration he cries out:

The wooing air is jubilant with song,
  And blossoms swell
As leaps thy liquid melody along
  The dusky dell,
  Where silence, late supreme, foregoes her wonted spell.

Thy hermitage is peopled with the dreams
  That gladden sleep;
Here fancy dallies with delirious themes,
  'Mid shadows deep,
  Till eyes, unused to tears, with wild emotions weep.

Yet thou, from mortal influence apart,
  Seek'st naught of praise;
The empty plaudits of the emptier heart
  Taint not thy lays:
  Thy Maker's smile alone thy tuneful bosom sways.

Tabb's sonnets are as near perfection as it is possible for mere human genius to attain. They are as stately and as chaste as the marble of Angelo, and are models of classic grace and elegance. Despite the fact that the sonnet limits the elasticity of expression, Tabb lost none of his power by submitting to its rules. In them he writes with the same clarity, with the same outpouring of poetic feeling as is found in his lyrics. Teeming with elevating sentiment, their tone and color bespeak a master hand. "Daybreak" is as noble a structure as we have in the whole anthology of English sonnets:

What was thy dream, sweet Morning for, behold,
  Thine eyes are heavy with the balm of night,
  And, as reluctant lilies, to the light
The languid lids of lethargy unfold.
Was it the tale of yesterday retold—
  An echo wakened from the western height,
  Where the warm glow of sunset dalliance bright
Grew, with the pulse of waning passion, cold?
Or was it some heraldic vision grand
  Of legends that forgotten ages keep
In twilight, where the sundering shoals of day
  Vex the dim sails, unpiloted of Sleep,
Till one by one the freighting fancies gay,
Like bubbles, vanish on the treacherous strand?

Shelley, Keats and Poe were the favorite authors of our poet, and he honors their memory in some beautiful and touching sonnets. Mark the beauty of the following sonnet, "At Keats' Grave:"

"I feel the flowers growing over me."
  Prophetic thought! Behold, no cypress gloom
  Portrays in dim memorial the doom
That quenched the ray of starlight destiny!
E'en death itself deals tenderly with thee:
  For here the live-long year the violets bloom
  And swing their fragrant censers till the tomb
Forgets the legend of mortality.
Nay: while the pilgrim periods of time
  Alternate song and holy requiem sing,
As through the circling centuries sublime
  They scatter frost or genial sunshine bring,
With gathered sweets of every varying clime
  They weave around thee one perpetual spring.

Poet and priest—doubly blest indeed was Father Tabb. To the simple, confiding faith of the priest were united the inspiration and spiritual insight of the poet. And with what glorious results! From the deep-rock springs of Christianity he drew his inspiration and made poetry the handmaid of religion, as she from the earliest times was ever wont to be, without intruding his own personal and private religion. The religion of his poems is a part of every man who believes in a Supreme Being; it is part of the scheme of the universe. Every line of Tabb's poetry uplifts, is ennobling and tends to make the reader a better man. Can as much be said of many other poets?

Tabb the man is gone, but Tabb the poet remains and will remain forever. True poetry is as immortal as the human heart, because it is the language of the heart. It cannot die as long as man is man. Tabb understood and spoke that language as did few others. Poetry to him was a passion; he sang for "the very joy of singing," from the fullness of an inspired soul. There is no false ornament, no glamor in his work. It is pure and unalloyed. It is

A gleam of heaven; the passion of a star
  Held captive in the clasp of harmony;
A silence shell-like, breathing from afar
  The rapture of the deep—Eternity.

JOSEPH L. O'BRIEN.

Emmitsburg, Md.

Book Reviews

THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS. A Study in Positive Theology. By *Very Rev. P. Pourrat, V. G.*, rector of the Theological Seminary of Lyons (France). Authorized translation from the third French edition. 12mo., pp. 417. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1910.

The third edition of this valuable book, brought up to date, in which the author has profited by the latest studies that have been published on the sacraments and the latest decrees, is most timely. As he said in the first edition:

"Liberal Protestantism triumphantly affirms, in the name of history, that the Catholic dogmas concerning the sacraments are purely human doctrines, and even that these Christian rites were borrowed from paganism. Other errors have also been put forth of late in regard to the relation of history to sacramentary theology.

"Called upon by his functions to submit those biased and exaggerated doctrines to a critical examination, the author has carefully studied the facts with the aid of a rigorously scientific method. The result of this impartial examination has been to show that an exclusively Christian inspiration presided over the origin of our dogmas regarding the sacraments and over the origin of those sacraments themselves, and that between the spiritual and patristic data in this matter and the sacramentary definitions of the Council of Trent, there exists a conformity sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind."

Conditions have not changed since this was written except for the worst. Protestantism has become more liberal until even the limited number of sacraments which formerly were acknowledged by some of the sects are now much more generally denied, or, at least, accepted in a lukewarm, careless, indifferent manner, which is almost equivalent to a denial.

At such a time positive theology is necessary, and it must be carefully and fearlessly taught.

"This study of positive sacramentary theology is based on the traditional conception of the development of dogma, that which St. Vincent of Lerins outlined in the fifth century, which Newman has set forth so powerfully in modern times, and which the Vatican Council has made its own."

This doctrine of the development of dogma finds, indeed, in sacramentary theology a particularly striking application. For the historical development of the Catholic dogma coincides fairly well with its logical development.

"It was the Trinitarian doctrines which first and almost exclusively absorbed the thoughts of ecclesiastical writers of the first four centuries. Then in the fifth and sixth centuries, the Nestorian, Pelagian and Monophysite heresies obliged the Church to fix the attention upon the Christological dogma, and upon those concerning original sin and grace. Only afterwards did Christian thought turn to the formal consideration of those means of grace and of remission of sin which are the sacraments.

"Therefore, while the development of the Trinitarian, Christological and Soteriological dogmas was almost entirely completed during the patristic period, that of the sacramentary dogmas went on more slowly. It was worked out in the Middle Ages by the scholastic theologians, who are the representatives of Catholic tradition in their time, as the fathers are in the first centuries.

"But although the development of the dogmas of the sacraments was rather late, the sacraments themselves have, from the very beginning, been used by the Church, which received them from Jesus Christ. 'The rites which possess the power of producing grace have always been practiced in the Church. To each ceremony was joined a traditional doctrine which explained its nature and effects. . . . But the systematic and philosophic form (of the doctrine) did evolve.' This quotation from the Abbé de Broglie expresses well the manner in which the dogmas of the sacraments developed; they are for the most part theoretical expressions of the practice of the Church with regard to the sacraments. The well-known saying, 'Lex orandi, lex credendi,' finds here its full justification.

"The reader, then, will not be tempted to conclude from the rather late formation of the theology of the sacraments to the late appearance of the sacraments themselves. Such an inference would be absolutely wrong."

It must be evident from these quotations that the author is working in a valuable and fruitful field. The result of his labors should be great in a quickening of faith and a spread of doctrine even among Protestants and unbelievers.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL AND THE VINCENTIANS IN IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND ENGLAND, A. D. 1638-1909. By *Rev. Patrick Boyle, C. M.* 12mo., pp. 318. R. & T. Washbourne, London.

Some one has truthfully said that a complete life of St. Vincent would entail the history of his times. Father Boyle helps us to realize this by showing us his great power and influence in a limited field. He says:

"The biographers of St. Vincent de Paul have set before their readers the whole life and works of the saints. From the circumstances of the case they could only devote a limited space to his services in any particular country.

"The object of this present volume is to set forth in fuller detail the services which Vincent in the seventeenth century, and his spiritual children in the nineteenth, have rendered to the Church in the British Isles.

"The work is divided into three books. The first book treats of the part which Irishmen had in the early history of the Congregation of the Mission, and of their labors in Ireland and in Scotland during the lifetime of the founder; of the succession of Irishmen in the community in the eighteenth century, and of the reëstablishment of the congregation in Ireland, England and Scotland in the nineteenth. It also contains an account of the establishment, development and work of the Sisters of Charity, of the Ladies' Association of Charity and of the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul.

"The second book is made up of a collection of letters of St. Vincent de Paul addressed to certain Irish priests of his community. A life-sketch of the priests is prefixed to the letters addressed to each. The letters, a translation of which is given in this book, compared with many contained in the full collection of his correspondence, are not of special importance. They have been selected because they were addressed to Irishmen. They treat of the ordinary details of community administration, but they present a true picture of what manner of man St. Vincent was in the management of business and in the details of ordinary life.

"The third book contains short life-sketches of some of the more prominent members of the Irish province of the Congregation of the Mission in the nineteenth century.

"In the appendix are to be found some documents of an official character, referred to in the course of this work, together with a list of the Irishmen who were members of the Congregation of the Mission from its foundation in 1625 to the French Revolution in 1793."

Altogether a very interesting and valuable volume of biography and history. It is only by the multiplication of such books, each dealing with a certain phase of his work or a certain period, that we can hope for the complete life and history of so great a man and his work as St. Vincent de Paul.

THE LIFE OF SAINT CLARE. Ascribed to *Father Thomas of Celano*, of the order of Friars Minor (A. D. 1255-1261). Translated and edited from the earliest manuscript by Father Paschal Robinson, of the same order, with an appendix containing the Rule of Saint Clare. 12mo., pp. 169, illustrated. Published by The Dolphin Press at Philadelphia, 1910.

The first thought that must come to the mind of any one who sees this book is, how well the volume and the subject fit together. It is an unusually attractive volume in form, but more so in matter. As the author says:

"It is said that devoted women have been the complement of almost all the men who have notably affected religion. However this may be, the story of St. Clare is linked so very closely with that of St. Francis in popular sentiment and imagination that it seems difficult to think of the one saint apart from the other. What is certain is that the gentleinfluence of the Assisian abbess played no small part in fashioning the life and forwarding the work of the Umbrian Poverello. Not only was St. Clare 'the chief rival of the Blessed Francis in the observance of Gospel perfection,' as an early chronicler styles her; she was also his chief ally in bringing about that great religious movement which told so wonderfully upon the spiritual life of the West and upon the history of the thirteenth century. No one else, indeed, appears to have caught the spirit of St. Francis so completely as St. Clare—that exquisite Franciscan spirit, as it is called, which is so tender and yet so strong, so human and yet so other-worldly—and in that spirit she threw around poverty an ineffable charm, such as women alone can impart to religious or civic heroism. After St. Francis was gone, Clare proved herself the faithful heiress of his ideals; and when those ideals were in danger of demolition, because some of his disciples would fain have tempered their master's teachings by the dictates of worldly wisdom, it was she who struggled to uphold them beyond all the rest. That struggle lasted more than a quarter of a century; it ended only with her life. But the victory lay with Clare, whose stedfast striving after an ideal through good report and evil report, no less than her engaging example of 'the praying spirit that worked as it prayed,' did much to guide the women of her day toward higher aims."

In addition to its value as the life of this great Franciscan written by a contemporary, it has the merit of being the only life of St. Clare in English. It will interest not only those who are lovers of St. Francis, or those who learn wisdom from all the saints, but even those who belong to neither of these classes, but who are refined enough to recognize and appreciate the higher things and better in the true sense.

St. Clare called herself "the little flower of St. Francis." St. Bonaventure says that she shed around her the fragrance of springtide. Something of that fragrance still clings to the story of her life and lends it a special charm. As the author says, "it is truly one of those lives that can teach perfection without sacrificing poetry. And in so far as it may be allowable to associate the idea of romance with such a subject, the friendship of St. Francis and

St. Clare forms one of the most romantic chapters in the lives of the saints."

BLESSED MARY OF THE ANGELS, Discalced Carmelite (1661-1717). A Biography. By *Rev. George O'Neill, S. J., M. A.*, Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland. 12mo., pp. 184. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, 1909.

The strictly contemplative orders are not generally in favor in our busy utilitarian country. This is principally because they are not known or understood. Therefore the life of a contemplative ought to have a special value for us. This thought must have been in the mind of the author when he said:

"It was not in the hope of attracting the 'ordinary reader' that I began this work. Nor, now that it is done, am I sure that it can be strongly recommended to him, even by a promise that it will certainly edify his individual soul. Yet (after allowing for faults of execution) I believe that it can—nay, even ought—to bring him pleasure and profit. If he be anything of a psychologist, one interested in rare types of human character and its developments, a student of that mysterious borderland of the invisible world with which 'science' is at long last beginning to concern herself, he will find food for thought in these pages. If he would study a type of exalted sanctity, a soul singularly elevated to Divine communion; if he desires to elevate himself by the afflatus of a great example, to catch some fire from another's burning love for God, here he may become acquainted with a seraph in human form. But so much depends upon the indisposition brought by the reader himself to a biography like this. Humility is certainly needful—*memor sit conditionis suae*. He is no final judge of what it narrates. He must not discuss the actions of God-illuminated, God-intoxicated souls with the offhand ease wherewith one criticizes the dress and manner of a casual acquaintance. He must not try to fathom with a foot-rule the dealings of the Almighty with those whom he chooses singularly honor, nor apply the small prudential standards that suffice for his own daily doings to the self-expressions of rare natures exceptionally guided. At the point where he ceases to understand, his word should be as submissive as that of the Apostle of the Gentiles: 'O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God.'"

These words form an excellent introduction to what follows—a wonderful record of a soul in constant close communion with its God, removing by the severest penances and mortifications all possible barriers to even more intimate relations, and assailed at all times by the spirits of darkness, who do all in their power to separate creature from Creator. It is a startling narrative and one especially suited to a so-called practical age.

THE SUPREME PROBLEM. An Examination of Historical Christianity From the Standpoint of Human Life and Experience and in the Light of Psychical Phenomena. By *J. Godfrey Raupert.* Peter Paul & Son, 136 North Pearl street, Buffalo, N. Y. 1910.

Although the author tells us that he writes from the standpoint of a layman, and does not claim for his book the dignity of a theological treatise, his education and experience as an Anglican clergyman give him the right to a cleric's point of view and to a more pretentious title. He entered the Church in 1895, but our readers will remember him best as the author of "Roads to Rome," "Ten Years in Anglican Orders" and "Modern Spiritism."

His interest in social work and his long journeys to Canada and elsewhere in behalf of London's outcast children have given him a knowledge of men and creeds which fits him in a special manner for the book before us. A glance at his own statement of his purpose and plan will be convincing:

"This volume does not claim to be a theological treatise. On the contrary, it is written from the standpoint of a layman who has thought much and long on what he conceives to be the supreme problem of human life, and who believes that the conclusions which he has reached respecting it may be helpful to other thoughtful and reflecting minds. He is thoroughly convinced, in spite of a thousand appearances to the contrary, that the solution of this supreme problem is easier and simpler than is commonly supposed, and that it lies within the reach of all men of normal mind and of good will.

"The book is thus essentially a human document. It is constructed upon and appeals to the simple and universal experiences of human life, and its reasoning is according to what may in fairness be called the necessary laws of human thought. It takes the facts of life and of consciousness as they really are and draws from them simple, natural and self-evident inferences. It does not occupy itself with speculative theories or philosophies or schools of thought, since these cannot, from their nature, contribute towards the end which the author has in view. It is, in his opinion, because of the multiplicity of these philosophies and theories and of the exaggerated importance and interest which are apt to be attached to them, and the fundamental truths themselves have become obscured, and that there has arisen the present almost hopeless confusion of ideas and beliefs. It is because men have ceased to be simple and to recognize the facts of life as they really are, and to be true to the instinctive dictates of their nature, that there are so many perplexed and miserable hearts in the world to-day.

"The author is convinced that the return to truth and to God is by way of the return to simplicity, and to recognition of first and necessary principles, and by a due appreciation of those constant experiences, in their relation to Revealed Truth, which in the normal man indicate not only the deep needs, but also the high possibilities of his nature.

"It is only too evident that in the strife of creeds and in the conflict of philosophies simple and fundamental things have been ignored and neglected, and that the voice of the soul has been silenced, or, to put it in another form, that the soul has lost God in arguments about Him.

"It is of the soul, therefore, not of the philosophers, or scientists, or even of theologians, that the author has inquired respecting the greatest of all problems, and it is its voice that he has made to speak in this volume. That it may speak in true and clear accents to men of good will, and by its message of simple, sound reason and commonsense tend, in some measure, to calm the hideous strife of tongues, which is at present disfiguring our religious and moral life, is the author's sincere desire and fervent prayer."

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES. By *Rev. Horace K. Mann*, Head Master of St. Cuthbert's School, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Corresponding Member of the Royal Academy of History of Spain. 8vo. Vol. IV., 891—999, pp. 453; Vol. V., 999—1,048, pp. 306. St. Louis: B. Herder.

Father Mann says:

"If edification were the sole, or even the principal object which I had in view in undertaking to write the biographies of the Popes of the early Middle Ages, I might perhaps have hesitated about publishing the present series. But I wish to pursue a higher end than that of indulging in a style of historical writing which is supposed to be calculated to edify a certain type of mind. I would fulfill what I regard as a command laid upon me by the late glorious Head of the Church, and strive to make known the history of the Popes of Rome. And, as it was a cardinal maxim with Leo XIII. that truth would not injure the Church, I am convinced that he would not have had the lives of some Popes written, and the lives of others left unrecorded; nor would he have wished to see some of their deeds blazoned forth and others buried in eternal oblivion.

"I know, too, that St. Gregory I., one of the greatest of the predecessors of Leo XIII., laid it down that 'if scandal be taken from the enunciation of truth, it is better to allow the scandal to arise than to leave the word of truth unrecorded.' Have I not also the assurance of St. Leo I. the Great that 'the dignity of Peter is not lost in an unworthy successor?' Besides, I believe that such as have the patience to read the following pages will probably conclude that the scandals of the Papacy of the Dark Ages are not so numerous as they imagined, and that excuses not a few serve to palliate most of those which did take place.

"Finally, as the history of the mediæval Papacy is a glorious one, it would appear to have been necessary for it to have its dark pages in order that its bright ones may be fully appreciated."

An author so well equipped for the work as Father Mann, with so important an epoch before him, with so full a realization of the dignity and importance of the task as well as its possibilities, must necessarily bring forth fruit worthy of the labor which he expends. We are not surprised at the excellence of the book, but should rather be much disappointed if it were in any degree diminished.

There is probably no period of church history which has had more historians, and none which has been more frequently maligned. We have never had any sympathy with the supposition that only an enemy can tell the truth about another who is not altogether perfect. On the contrary, we hold that a good, true friend is the safest man in the world to correct the faults of his neighbor. There is much greater danger that an enemy will increase the evil and lessen the good in one whom he hates than that a friend will pursue the opposite course.

For this reason especially we want Catholic history from Catholic historians, and for this reason particularly we welcome Father Mann's "Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages."

PORFIRIO DIAZ, President of Mexico. The Master Builder of a Great Commonwealth. By *José F. Godoy*, author of "A Few Facts About Mexico," "The Legal and Mercantile Handbook of Mexico," etc. With sixty illustrations, maps and diagrams. 12mo., pp. 253. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London. The Knickerbocker Press, 1910.

Probably the most important biography of the year. From earliest manhood until the present time the life of President Diaz has been so much an integral part of the history of Mexico, and Mexico has taken so prominent a place among the republics of the world under his wise and able direction, that the life of the man possesses an interest that is intensest in his own country, but is also very great throughout the world.

"I look at Porfirio Diaz, the President of Mexico, as one of the greatest men to be held up for the hero-worship of mankind." These words, uttered by Senator Elihu Root, when in 1907 and as

Secretary of State of the United States, he visited the Mexican Republic, fully justify the publication of any work which, containing reliable data, may give an impartial and truthful account of the life of President Diaz.

The wonderful career of this great man, both owing to his military achievements and to his great success as a statesman, cannot fail, and has not failed up to now, to claim the attention not only of his countrymen, but also of the whole civilized world.

In the English-speaking countries the desire to have a thorough knowledge of the past deeds and present achievements of General Porfirio Diaz is frequently manifested. The writer of this work, therefore, thinks that a book prepared like the present one and based upon accurate information, a great deal of which has been obtained through personal observation, will prove interesting to the reading public of the United States and England.

It may be here stated that, in order to present the facts as they really happened, and with preciseness and accuracy as to dates and some other circumstances, the President himself, some members of his family and his chief advisers and many of his friends have been consulted, thereby correcting any misstatement that unintentionally might have crept into the narrative.

NOTRE VIE SURNATURELLE (Tome Premier). *Ch. de Smedt, S. J., Bollandiste.* Bruxelles: Albert Dewit, 53 Rue Royale.

This publication is given to the world by a missionary of long and varied experience. It is the fruit of a careful and assiduous study of the foremost masters of theological and ascetical science, especially of St. Thomas of Aquin, Suarez, St. Ignatius, St. Francis de Sales and St. Teresa. No less is it the outcome of long years spent in carefully observing both himself and others. The author can look back upon almost sixty years of religious and nearly fifty of sacerdotal life, all filled up with unceasing labors, such as could fit him eminently to write with authority on the matters here treated. The teaching of the sacred sciences, writing lives of the saints, giving numbers of missions and spiritual retreats to various classes of people, filling the office of instructor and confessor in several religious communities of men and women, these are the works to which the pious author has devoted this long lapse of years. How often, during the exercise of his apostolic ministry, has he met with numbers of fervent souls, filled with a sincere and energetic desire of arriving at Christian perfection, but hindered or considerably delayed in their progress by interior troubles, which were occasioned by the vague, unprecise, inexact or totally false ideas which they had formed of the end they were to aim at and the means to attain it. To scatter these clouds, to impart courage, confidence and peace has been his constant effort.

The book now published by the venerable missionary will no doubt confer the same benefits on many an afflicted soul.

This volume comprises an introduction, "Des différentes especès de vies réunies en l'homme," followed by two parts—first, "La grâce sanctifiante, principe de la vie surnaturelle;" second, "Les vertus surnaturelles, principes de l'activité de la vie surnaturelle."

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES, ROME, ITALY. By *Right Rev. Henry A. Brann, D. D., LL. D.*, rector of St. Agnes' Church, New York city. 8vo., pp. 570, illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The learned author tells us that he waited eight years after writing this book before publishing it, in order to make it more historically correct. It is so excellent that we feel fully consoled for the delay. Dr. Brann has done his work so well that American College Alumni will be prouder than ever of their alma mater, and those who were not so fortunate as to be called to Rome will be tempted to envy. The book is an important contribution to Roman ecclesiastical history as well as to American, because the two are so closely united by the American College in the Eternal City as to be inseparable.

The story of the foundation, the development, the growth and progress of the institution is interesting not only to its past and present students, but to all Catholics.

The reminiscences of the earlier alumni, which form a considerable part of the book, are unusually interesting, while the very full account of the golden jubilee celebration of the college in 1909 brings the history right up to date. The illustrations are excellent and add very much to the value of the book.

ENCHIRIDION HISTORIAE ECCLESIASTICAE UNIVERSAE, auctore *P. Albers, S. J.* Tomus I. Desclee et Cie, Roma; B. Herder, Friburgi, Brisgoviae.

In this volume we are given the first portion in Latin of a most excellent and useful work, which is the result of years of deep, earnest and thorough research on the part of its learned author. As he himself informs us, ever since the time that he was appointed to lecture from the chair of ecclesiastical history, he carefully drew up his instructions and lectures in such a form as that they could all be readily united at the suitable time in a manual and published for the use not only of priests and ecclesiastical students, but of educated laymen as well. To ensure the attainment of this end, the work is abundantly supplied with useful references to the various sources, whence every church historian may derive his information; they are found at the foot of almost every page of the book; also a detailed list of authorities is given at the beginning of every paragraph of each chapter.

This publication is the first edition in the Latin language of Father Albers' work, which has seen two previous editions in its original language, the Dutch. The author is careful, however, to note that the present edition is really a third and a more elaborate one than the first two, since he has not only reviewed, but increased and perfected the work before putting this Latin version of it into the hands of the printer.

The book here presented, being the first volume, comprises the first age of the Church, embracing two periods, viz.: First, the time elapsing from the Church's foundation down to the Edict of Milan (A. D. 1-313); second, from the Edict of Milan down to the Trullan Council (A. D. 313-692).

GERSON TRAITE DU DEVOIR DE CONDUIRE LES ENFANTS A JESUS CHRIST. Traduit par *l'Abbe A. Saubin.* Bloud et Cie, 7 place Saint-Sulpice, Paris.

This being one of the most excellent of the writings of the learned and pious Gerson, we have every reason to be grateful to M. Saubin for having placed this precious document within our reach. Though possessing the aroma of antiquity, this book should be perused and meditated and circulated far and wide at the present day. In simple and touching and discreet language it eulogizes the holy work of Christian education. Teachers should meditate on it and recommend to parents the reading of it. Its object is none other than to encourage children to come to Christ, to teach them the way of doing so, to remove scandal from their path and thus protect them from the greatest dangers and evils. Can there be any work more noble, more sublime and, above all, more necessary at the present time?

MISSALE ROMANUM. 8vo. Sumptibus et Typis Frederici Pustet, Neo Eboraci.

A remarkable book, especially because it combines the good qualities of apparently irreconcilable things and seems to make extremes meet. Heretofore small hand missals have been useless for altar purposes, and those made for practical service have been too large and heavy for hand use. In the book before us the two have been successfully united—the hand-missal and the altar-missal are one. This book is so light and convenient in size that it is a pleasure to hold it in the hand for consultation or while assisting at Mass, and yet the type is so large and clear and the book is so well made that it can be used by the celebrant of the Mass with entire satisfaction.

It is in the best sense of the word the traveler's missal, for it is equally useful in the hand or on the altar, and it takes up small space.

APOLOGETIQUE VIVANTE—Une Conversion de Protestants par la Sainte Eucharistie, par le *P. Emmanuel Abt, S. J.* One vol. in 16 (100 pages). Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, rue de Rennes 117, Paris.

This little book comes most opportunely in the collection entitled "Apologétique Vivante" after the handsome work of P. H. d'Arras, S. J., "Une Anglaise Concertie." The work had at first appeared, like its predecessor, in a series of articles in one of the foremost reviews of Paris. Its narrative was so interesting, edifying and lifelike that a universal demand arose to have the whole of the articles published in book form. It is the converts themselves, who, in their autobiography, narrate and describe their spiritual life in Protestantism. They show how grace rewards the sincere efforts made by those outside the true fold to attain to the full knowledge of the truth, and leads them mysteriously at last into the haven of religious peace and rest, the Catholic Church. Finally they come to describe their conversion as it actually took place through the marvelous intervention of the Blessed Eucharist.

The mother of a family, the chief cause of all the good wrought, felt within herself an ardent longing for the Bread of Life. After Protestantism was shown to be unable to satisfy her irresistible desire, the eager soul learned that the Catholic Church would give her all she sought. Thenceforth she never desisted from her efforts until, with her family and a number of other souls besides, she entered the fold of the true Church of Christ.

It is to be hoped that this book will bring to many a wandering soul that peace which can be found only in the true faith and within the one only fold of the Good Shepherd.

HISTOIRE DE SAINT FRANCOIS DE BORGIA, TROISIEME GENERAL DE LA COMPAGNIE DE JESUS, par *Pierre Suau, S. J.* One vol. in 8, raisin avec portraits. Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, rue de Rennes 117, Paris.

The volume here presented to the public is the outcome of the persevering labor of many years, aided by the discovery of valuable documents hitherto unedited. The book entirely renews the history of St. Francis Borgia, and bound up as was this history with political and religious events of the first importance, the new contribution will be a most valuable aid to the student.

St. Francis Borgia captivates our attention in many ways—by his name and descent, his intimate friendship with Charles V., his functions at the court, his career as statesman, the tragical adventures in which he figured, the part he took in the religious events of the period and even his sanctity—and his historian and biographer, by the help of newly-found rich sources of information, has been enabled to repicture all these phases of his life in a most striking and captivating style.

The author is complete master of his subject and of the language in which he handles it; but his chief concern is to do the part of a historian—viz., to know the truth and to make it known to his readers. This biography will doubtless hold a foremost rank amongst the lives of the saints.

PRIM UND COMPLET DES ROMISCHEN BREVIERS, liturgisch und aszetisch erklärt. Von *Dr. Nikolaus Gihr.* Herder, Freiburg (St. Louis, Mo.), 1907. Pr., $1.85.

The author of this volume will be well known to those who are acquainted with the solid religious literature in German by his classical work on the Mass (two volumes; Herder), now in its tenth edition, and his two volumes on the sacraments. Besides these he has written a dogmatico-ascetic treatise on the "Sequences of the Missal" (now in a second edition). All these have a place in Herder's "Theological Library," to which also the present book on the *Prime* and *Compline* of the Roman Breviary belongs. The work is essentially an exposition of the liturgical and ascetical significance of these two parts of the Divine Office. The priest or levite who reads it cannot fail to have his "intellect illumined and his affection enkindled," and be enabled to fulfill his sacred duty with that "worthiness and devotion" which the divine prayer demands.

LE BRAHMANISME, par *L. de la Vallée-Poussin,* professeur à l'Université de Gand. One vol. in 12 de 128 pages. Bloud et Cie, 7 place Saint-Sulpice, Paris (Vie).

This volume is one of the series which the distinguished professor of the University of Gand has undertaken to furnish on the religions of India.

These small volumes, notwithstanding their brevity, contain the result of long and patient research on the part of the author. A complete mastery of his subject is evidenced in every part of the writing. The subject, though abstruse and difficult, is brought within easy grasp, in its general outlines, of the ordinary reader.

70567

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM